

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1870.

ART. I.—THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S  
SUPPER, AS CONFESSED BY THE EVANGELICAL LU-  
THERAN CHURCH, THETICALLY STATED, WITH THE  
EXEGETICAL ARGUMENT.

---

BY CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D.D.,

*Norton Professor of Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary,  
and Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in the  
University of Pennsylvania.*

---

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

I. *Old Testament Foreshadows; 1. The Sacraments in Eden.*

IN approaching one of the highest, if not the very highest, of the mysteries of our faith, it becomes us to prepare ourselves for a most earnest, patient, and candid investigation of the Scriptural grounds, on which that faith rests. The Lord's Supper has been looked at too much as if it were an isolated thing, with no antecedents, no pre-suppositions, no sequences; as if there were nothing before it, nothing after it, helping to determine its true character; while, in fact it links itself with the whole system of Revelation, with the most vital parts of the Old and New Testament, so that it cannot be torn from its true connections without logically bringing with it the

whole system. There is no process by which the doctrine of the Lutheran Church in regard to the Lord's Supper can be overthrown, which does not overthrow the entire fabric of the Atonement. No man can deem our distinctive doctrine of the Lord's Supper non-fundamental who thoroughly understands it in all its relations.

The first thing worthy of note in regard to the sacramental mystery is its antiquity. It meets us at the threshold of the divine history of our race. In Eden we see already the idea of natural and supernatural eating. We have there the natural eating terminating in the natural, in the words: "Of every tree of the Garden thou mayest freely eat." Closely following upon this we have the idea of supernatural eating, with the natural bodily organ. "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat; for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Man did eat of it, and found it a sacrament of death. In, with, and under that food, as a divine means judicially appointed, was communicated death. That

"mortal taste

Brought death into the world and all our woe."

The great loss of Paradise Lost, was that of the Sacrament of Life, of that food, in, with, and under which was given immortality, so objectively, positively, and really that even fallen man would have been made deathless by it: "Now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever." Gen. iii. 22. The great gain of Paradise Regained is that of the Sacrament of Life. Christ says: "I am the life;" "The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." The cross of Christ is the tree of life, and He the precious fruit borne by heavenly grace upon it. The cross is the center of Paradise Regained, as the tree of life was the center of the first Paradise. Christ's body is the organ of the life purchased by His obedience and death. The Holy Supper is the sacrament of that body, and, through the body, the sacrament of the life which that body brings. But that same body is also a sacrament of death to the unworthy recip-

ient. The whole sacrament on its two sides of death and life is in it united: salvation to the believer, judgment to the unworthy. After the creation of man, God's first provision was for the generation and birth of the race, the foreshadowing of regeneration and of the new birth, for which, in Holy Baptism, the first provision is made in the new creation of the New Testament. The next provision made for man was that of sustenance for the life given, or yet to be given. In the Garden of Eden was a moral miniature of the universe; and with the act of eating were associated the two great realms of the natural and the supernatural; and with this was connected the idea of the one as a means of entering the other, of the natural as the means of entering into the supernatural. There were natural trees with purely natural properties, whose fruit was eaten naturally, and whose benefits were simply natural; bodily eating, terminating in a bodily sustenance. But there was also the natural terminating in the supernatural. There were two trees, striking their roots into the same soil, lifting their branches in the same air—natural trees—but bearing by Heaven's ordinance, in, with, and under their fruitage, supernatural properties. One was the sacramental tree of good. We call it a *sacramental tree*, because it did not merely symbolize life, or signify it; but, by God's appointment, so gave life—in, with, and under its fruit—that to receive its fruit was to receive life. The fruit which men there would have eaten was the communion of life. On Gen. iii. 22, the sound old Puritan commentator, Poole, thus paraphrases: "Lest he take also of the tree of life, as he did take of the tree of knowledge, and thereby profane that *sacrament of eternal life*."

With this tree of life was found the tree which was the sacrament of judgment and of death, and by man's relations to that tree would be tested whether he was good or evil, and by it he would continue to enjoy good or plunge himself into evil. By an eating, whose organs were natural, but whose relations were supernatural, man fell and died. This whole mystery of evil, these pains and sorrows which overwhelm the race, the past, the present, and the future of sin, revolve around a sin-

gle natural eating, forbidden by God, bringing the offender into the realm of the supernatural for judgment. We learn here what fearful grandeur may be associated in the moral government of God, with a thing in itself so simple as the act of eating. The first record of Revelation is an awful warning against the plausible superficiality of rationalism. It was the rationalistic insinuation of Satan, as to the meaning of God's Word, which led to the Fall. "Abandon faith in the letter of God's Word," said the Devil. Our first parents obeyed the seductive insinuation and died.

In the Lord's Supper three great ideas meet us as they met in Paradise. There is in it, 1, *Bread*, which, as bread, is the natural food of man, and belongs to all men. But there is also, 2, The supernatural element of *life*: "My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." The natural bread, as the sacramental bearer of this heavenly food, is the communion of the body of Christ, that is, the medium by which the body is communicated or imparted. There is also in the Lord's Supper, 3, The supernatural element of *judgment*, and that of judgment unto death. "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (or, judgment) unto himself, not discerning the Lord's body." The tree of life, as our theologians well observed, was not a memorial, a symbol, a suggestive emblem or sign; but was a supernatural, efficacious and energetic means of life. "This tree," says Osiander (1589), "by the divine ordination and will, bore fruit which could preserve the bodily vigor of him who partook of it ('in perpetual youth') until man, having completed the term of his earthly life, would, without dying, have been translated to his life in heaven." So also the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, did not symbolize a result, but brought it. *Life* was in, with, and under the fruit of the one tree; death, in, with, and under the fruit of the other.

This view is not a modern invention. It is found in Irenæus, St. Chrysostom, and Theodoret. Gregory Nazianzen enlarges upon the idea of "being made immortal by coming to the tree of life." St. Augustine says, "In the other trees there was



nourishment; in this one, a sacrament ("in isto autem Sacramentum"). Vatablus, (1557), a very judicious Roman Catholic expositor, fairly expresses the general sense of the Fathers in stating his own. "The tree of life was a *sacrament*, by which God would have sealed immortal life to Adam, if he had not departed from His Commandment." Delitzsch: "The tree of life had the power of ever renewing and of gradually transfiguring the natural life of man. To have used it after the Fall would have been to perpetuate for ever the condition into which he had fallen."

Nor is the true view without support from sources whence we might least expect it. Rosenmuller (Rationalistic): "This writer means that the weakened powers were to be revived by eating of that tree, and this life was to be preserved forever." Knobel (strongly Rationalistic): "This passage (Gen. iii. 22) teaches that man after partaking of the tree of life would have become immortal." Dr. Bush, both in his earlier and later notes on Genesis (1833, 1852), says: "Adam might frequently have eaten (ed. 1852, "undoubtedly often ate") of the tree of life before the Fall—sacramentally as Christians eat of the Lord's Supper. In regard to the driving from Paradise 'lest he also eat of the tree of life and live forever,' Irenæus said: 'God has so ordered it that evil might not be immortal, and punishment might become love to man.'" Dr. Bush, who, had his judgment been in the ratio of his other endowments, would undisputably have taken the first rank among American commentators on the Old Testament, says, Gen. iii. 22, 23: "The language it must be acknowledged, seems to imply, that had man tasted of the tree of life, even after his rebellion, he would have lived forever, and that he was expelled from Paradise to prevent such a consequence." The conclusion, however, is so little in keeping with Dr. Bush's theology, that he undertakes to reason it away in a very feeble and rationalistic manner, in the face of what he concedes to be the obvious meaning of the passage.

2. *Flesh and Blood.*

Another hint toward the true view of the sacramental mystery is given us in the Divine declaration Gen. ix. 4: "But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat." Literally: "But flesh with its soul (*i. e.* life), its blood, ye shall not eat." Still more literally: "in its soul."

At the root of this prohibition lay a great typical idea which can be fully understood only in the light of the finished sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the light of His sacramental Supper, in which we participate in, or have communion with that sacrifice. The command was repeated again and again, and the reason most generally assigned was that the blood is the life of the flesh. But this reason seems itself to require an explanation, and this we find fully given in Leviticus, the book in which there is the amplest display of the typical element of sacrifice. In Lev. xvii. 10-14, we have a full explanation of the meaning of the reservation of the blood. It is especially the 11th verse in which the typical force of the prohibition is made manifest. Under the Old Testament they actually ate of the body of the sacrifice, but only drank a symbol of its blood. It was manifest that the reservation of the blood pointed to something yet to be accomplished, and hinted that the perfect communion in the whole sacrifice was reserved for another dispensation. Only in the light of this can we fully appreciate the startling character of our Lord's command, when for the first time in the history of the chosen race, He gave the command to drink that which He declared to be the blood of the New Covenant.

3. *The Supernatural and Natural Eating.*

When the three men, Gen. xviii., one of whom is called Jehovah, appeared to Abraham, the patriarch set before them bread, flesh, butter, and milk, and they did eat. Verse 8.

Here was the supernatural eating of the natural; the eating of natural food with the natural organ of an assumed body, and that body of course supernatural. These same three

heavenly persons did eat (Gen. xix. 3) of unleavened bread in the house of Lot.

Is there a greater mystery in the sacramental eating, in which the supernatural communicates itself by the natural, by the natural bread, to the natural mouth, than there is in this true eating, in which the supernatural partakes of the natural? If God can come down and partake of human food by human organs, so that it is affirmed of Jehovah that He did eat, He can lift the human to partake of what is divine by a process which though supernatural is yet most real.

#### 4. *The Relations of Covenant to Sacrifice.*

The relations of sacrifice to covenant in the Old Testament suggest instructive parallels to the Lord's Supper. In Gen. xv. we have the covenant between God and Abraham sealed with sacrifice. In Gen. xxxi. 44, 46, is presented the idea of eating as an act of covenant. Laban said to Jacob: "Let us make a covenant," "and they did eat there upon the heap"; where eating is the crowning act of the covenant. But more than this is presented in this chapter, for in the particulars of the ratification of the covenant we are told (verse 54), "Then Jacob offered sacrifice upon the mount, and called his brethren to eat bread: and they did eat bread." Here is the idea, first, of sacrifice as the inseparable constituent in the covenant; then, of joint participation in the sacrifice by eating of it, by the parties partaking in the covenant through it.

#### 5. *The Relations of Sacrifice to Sacrament.*

The idea of sacrifice under the Old Dispensation sheds light upon the nature of the Lord's Supper. "Without the shedding of blood is no remission." The slaying of the victim by shedding its blood, by which alone its death could be effected, was properly the sacrifice. After the sacrifice was made, two things were essential to securing its end: first, that God should receive it; second, that man should participate in it. The burning of the sacrifice by fire from heaven was the means of God's accepting it on the one side; and eating of it, the means

of man's participating on the other. The truth is, that the sacrifice of the Old Testament resolves itself into the very elements which we find in the Lord's Supper. The Altar was the Table of the Lord, and the whole conception of sacrifice runs out into this, that it is a covenanting Supper between God and man.

The sacrifice, through the portion burnt, is received of God by the element of fire; the portion reserved is partaken of by men, is communicated to them, and received by them. The eating of one portion of the sacrifice, by the offerer, is as real a part of the whole sacred act as the burning of the other part is. Man offers to God; this is sacrifice. God gives back to man; this is sacrament. The oblation or thing offered supplies both sacrifice and sacrament, but with this difference, that under the Old Dispensation God received part and man received part; but under the New, God receives all and gives back all: Jesus Christ in His own divine person making that complete which was narrowed under the Old Covenant by the necessary limitations of mere matter. But in both is this common idea, that all who receive or commune in the reception of the oblation, either on the one part as a sacrifice, or on the other as a sacrament, are in covenant; and in the light of this alone is it, that not on Calvary where the sacrifice was made, but in the Supper where the sacrifice is applied, the Saviour says: "This is the New Testament (the new covenant) in My blood."

#### 6. *The Passover is a type of the Supper.*

The New Testament strikes its roots down into the very heart of the Old Dispensation, and to understand either we must study both together. Let us compare in the case of the paschal lamb and paschal supper, the type and the fulfilment, and we shall see how the earlier sheds light upon the later, and how both placed in their true relation illustrate each other. The following are but a part of the points of illustration, but they may be sufficient to lead the attentive student of God's Word to search for himself.

1. The passover was to be a *lamb*, and Christ is the true

*Lamb.* "They shall take to them every man a *lamb*," are the words of the institution of the passover.—Ex. xii. 3. The key to the typical reference of the lamb is already given in the words of Isaiah (liii.) "He" (the man of sorrows) "is brought as a *lamb* to the slaughter." But the New Testament unfolds the typical reference in all its clearness. "Behold the *Lamb* of God," (John i. 29, 36); "the blood of Christ, as of a *lamb*." 1 Pet. i. 12. It is by this name that Christ is revealed in the glories of the apocalyptic vision: "In the midst of the elders stood a *lamb*," "the elders fell down before the *lamb*": "Worthy is the *Lamb* that was slain." The title "*lamb*," is applied to our Lord between thirty and forty times in the New Testament.

2. The Paschal lamb was to be *typically perfect*, and Christ was *truly perfect*. The typical characteristics of the Paschal lamb it is not necessary here to dwell upon. It was to be perfect and unblemished in every respect to typify Him, who both in body and soul was spotless, "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." "Ye were redeemed . . . with the precious blood of Christ, as of a *lamb without blemish and without spot*."—1 Pet. i. 12.

3. The Paschal lamb was to be *slain* as a type of redemption, and Christ was to be slain for the verity of redemption. "The whole assembly shall *kill* it." Ex. xii. 6. "Who *killed* the Lord Jesus." 1 Thes. ii. 15. "Lo, in the midst of the throne stood a Lamb as it *had been slain*. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou wast *slain*, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood. Worthy is the Lamb that was *slain*." Rev. v. 6-12.

4. The Passover was a typical sacrifice in the realm of the natural, and Christ is a true sacrifice in the realm of the supernatural. "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover." Exodus xii. 27. "Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed *for us*." Christ hath given Himself for us, an *offering* and a *sacrifice* to God. "When He said: Sacrifice and offering, and burnt offering, and offering for sin, Thou wouldst not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; *then* said He, Lo, I come to do

Thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second. By which will we are sanctified through *the offering of the body* of Jesus Christ once for all." Psalm xl. 6-8; Heb. x. 8-10. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works?" Heb. ix. 14.

5. The Paschal Supper was a typical, natural eating of the typical, natural lamb; the Lord's Supper is a true, supernatural eating of the true, supernatural Lamb. "And they shall *eat the flesh* in that night." Exod. xii. 8. "The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My flesh hath eternal life. He that eateth My flesh dwelleth in Me. My flesh is meat indeed." John vi. 51-56. "Thus shall ye eat it," said Jehovah. Exod. xii. 11. "Take, eat," said our Lord.

6. The Paschal Supper was a typical, natural *act*; the Lord's Supper is a true, supernatural *act*. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord—he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (or judgment) to himself, NOT DISCERNING THE LORD'S BODY!"—1 Cor. x. 16; xi.

7. The Paschal Supper was a *natural communion* of the type; the Lord's Supper is a *supernatural communion* of the substance.

8. The Paschal Supper was a feast by which the typical was presented in, with, and under the natural; the Lord's Supper is a feast by which the *true* is presented in, with, and under the natural.

9. In the Paschal Supper the body of the typical lamb was received, together with the bread, after a natural manner; in the Lord's Supper the body of the true Lamb is received, together with the bread, after a supernatural manner.



10. The natural eating of the typical Paschal lamb belongs to the sphere of lower reality—that is, of mere earthly and carnal fact; the supernatural eating of the true Paschal Lamb belongs to the sphere of higher reality—that is, of heavenly and spiritual truth.

Thus does the dim twilight of the dawning Old Testament, if rightly used, open to us a purer vision of truth than unwilling eyes can find in the sunlight of the New Testament. How does the parallel run out into the minutest particulars between these representative institutions of the two great dispensations!

11. Of the Paschal festival, Jehovah said: "This day shall be unto you for a memorial;" of the Lord's Supper, the incarnate Jehovah said: "This do in remembrance of Me." Luke xxii. 19.

12. "The blood shall be to you for a token," says Jehovah. "This is My blood of the New Testament"—"the communion of the blood of Christ"—"is guilty . . . of the blood of the Lord."

13. "When I see the blood I will pass over you, and the plague shall not rest upon you," says Jehovah. "This is My blood," says our Lord, "shed for you and for many for the remission of sins."

14. "Ye shall keep it a feast," says Jehovah. "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast," 1 Cor. v. 8, or as Luther, bringing out still more clearly this element in the words, renders them: "We also have a paschal lamb, that is Christ, offered for us, wherefore let us keep pass-over." (*Oster-lamm, Ostern.*)

15. Ye shall keep it to the Lord . . . throughout your generations."—"Ye do show the Lord's death till He come." 1 Cor. xi. 26.

16. "The man that . . . forbearth to keep the passover, even the same soul shall be cut off from among his people." "Except ye *eat the flesh* of the Son of man, and *drink His blood*, ye *have no life in you*." "Whosoever eateth *leavened bread*, that soul shall be cut off from Israel." "He that eateth and drinketh *unworthily*, eateth and drinketh *damna-*



*tion [ or judgment ] to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.* For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." 1 Cor. xi. 29, 30.

17. Strike the lintel . . with the blood." "This is My blood which is shed for many." "Ye are come to the blood of sprinkling,"—"elect . . through sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

18. "In one house shall it be eaten." "Having an high priest over the house of God"—"Christ whose house are we." "Ye come into one place." "The members of that one body, being many, are one body." "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread."

19. "Thou shalt not carry forth aught of the flesh abroad out of the house." Ex. xii. 46. "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." Heb. xiii. 10.

20. "When a stranger shall sojourn with thee and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it." Exod. xii. 48. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Cor. xii. 13.

21. "One law shall be to him that is home-born, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you." Exod. xii. 49. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

22. "All the congregation of Israel shall keep it," (Hebrew: do it.) Exod. xii. 48. "Drink ye all of this; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me." Matt. xxvi. 27, 1 Cor. xi. 25.

Origen cont. Celsum VIII: "Christ our passover is slain and this feast is to be kept, by eating the flesh of the Logos."

"ὅτι το πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐδόθη χριστός καὶ χρὴ εὐχαριστεῖν ἐσθιόντα

της σαρκος του λογου." Beza on 1 Cor. v. 7: "Our whole life should be in conformity with Christ, that feast of unleavened bread, in which we were made partakers of that spotless Lamb who was slain." Grotius: "As by the blood of the Paschal lamb, the Israelites were delivered from destruction, so also Christians, by the blood of Christ are liberated from the common ruin of mankind. That lamb was to be without fault, and Christ was without fault. (See Luke xxii. 16). Christ therefore is the mystic passover, that is the Paschal Lamb." On 1 Cor. v. 7.

Amid all these transitions from type to fulfilment the change is never from the more true to the less true, nor from the real to the ideal, but there is either a coincidence in the natural with an elevated use in the New Dispensation, or a higher natural with a true supernatural attached to it. There is in both, for example, a coincidence in a *real shedding* of blood, though in the shedding of Christ's blood there is a supernatural efficacy; there is in both a *real eating*, but in the one the communion effected is earthly, in the other it is heavenly. This then is the point to which these great Biblical truths irresistibly lead us, that CHRIST IS THE TRUE PASCHAL LAMB, AND THE SUPPER OF CHRIST IS THE TRUE PASCHAL SUPPER. What the paschal lamb of the Old Dispensation typified, Christ is; and what the paschal supper of the Old Dispensation typified, the supper of Christ is; and that which is promised and shadowed in the paschal supper is given in the Lord's supper, in very deed and substance. The supernatural presence of Christ's body and blood cannot be less true, but is more true, than the natural presence of the body and blood of the paschal lamb.

That the true relation between the two paschal lambs, and the two paschal suppers, should be most clear, it pleased God that there should be a coincidence in point of time between the ending of the shadow and the full appearing of the substance. The Sun of Revelation stood at its perfect zenith, and the shadow was cast no longer by the substance, because the shadow lay beneath Christ's feet. The sun stands henceforth, at its noontide, and we are done with shadows forever. Therefore it was written in

God's purposes that the true paschal Lamb should be slain at the feast of the old Passover. Our blessed Lord dwelt upon the time as in itself an essential element of the perfectness of His work: "With desire have I desired to eat *this* Passover with you before I suffer," (Luke xxii. 15): "Before the feast of the Passover, Jesus knew that His hour was come." John xiii. 1.

It was at the Passover time, in a Passover family group of disciples, in a room prepared for the Passover, that the Lord's Supper was instituted. The bread which our Lord brake, was bread provided for the Passover. The cup which He blessed was filled with wine prepared for the Passover. It is a new Paschal Supper. But where is the *slain lamb* of this new Paschal? Where is that *verity* in it of which the unspotted lamb of the first paschal is the type? Where is that shed blood of which the shed blood of the first paschal is the type? Is it to be characteristic of the New Testament Paschal Supper that it shall have *no paschal lamb*; that there shall be *bread and wine*, but that the great element of the *soul's nourishment*, the *lamb itself*, of which these were but the accompaniments, and as *attendants of which* alone they were given, that the *lamb* shall be wanting? "Christ our *Passover*, our *Paschal Lamb*, is slain for us; therefore let us keep the feast." 1 Cor. v. 8. To feed upon the paschal lamb is the *grand object of the feast*, and if the *Lord's Supper* be but the taking of bread and wine, the true paschal lamb not being truly present, and not truly received, then is the substance more shadowy than the shadow, and the Christian at his Supper, has less than the Jew at his Passover. Well might a child-like faith breathe a sigh, as it were an echo of the innocent words of Isaac: "My father: behold the fire and the wood; but WHERE IS THE LAMB?"—but a faith like that of Abraham, in the light of a new dispensation, will answer: "My son, God has provided Himself a lamb."

#### 7. *The Manna in the Desert.*

"They said one to another: It is manna. (*Sept.*: What is this? *Ti esti touto.*) And Moses said unto them, This is the

bread (*Sept.: outos o artos*), which the Lord hath given you to eat. This is the thing (*Sept.: Touto to rema*), which the Lord hath commanded." Exod. xvi. 15. "I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead. This is the bread (*outos estin o artos*), which cometh down from heaven, that he that eateth of it may not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." John vi. 49-57. "All (our fathers) did eat the same spiritual meat." 1 Cor. x. 3. *Cyrril (Lib. iv. in Joh. xvi.)*: "The manna was not therefore the living food, but the sacred body of Christ is the food which nourisheth to eternal life." *Lombard (Lib. iv. Sentent.)*: "That bodily bread brought the ancient people to the land of promise through the desert; this heavenly food will carry the faithful, passing through the desert, to heaven." *Gerhard, John (Loc. xxii. ch. ii.)*: "By that bread which came down from heaven, that is by Christ's body, we are nourished, that we perish not with hunger in the desert of this world."

In quoting the sixth chapter of John, as bearing on the Lord's Supper, it may be well, once for all, to say that it is quoted not on the supposition that it speaks of the Lord's Supper specifically, but that in stating the general doctrine of the life-giving power of Christ's flesh and blood, it states a doctrine under which the benefits of the sacramental eating come as a species. If we come into supernatural, blessed participation of Christ's flesh and blood, in the act of faith, without the Lord's Supper, *a fortiori*, we have blessed participation of them in the act of faith with the Lord's Supper. The sixth of John treats of the grand end of which the Lord's Supper is the grand means. We partake of Christ's body and blood sacramentally, in order that we may partake of them savingly. Of the latter, not of the former, the sixth of John speaks.

## II. *The New Testament Doctrine of the Lord's Supper Thetically Stated.*

The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as the Lutheran Church

believes it to be set forth in the New Testament, is thus defined in her great general Symbol, The Augsburg Confession :

Of the holy Supper of our Lord, our Churches, with one consent, teach and hold ;

1. That the *true* body and blood of Christ are the sacramental objects.

2. That the sacramental objects are *truly* present in the Lord's Supper.

3. That this true presence is under the form or species of *bread and wine*.

4. That present, under this form or species, they are *communicated*.

5. That thus communicated, they are *received by all Communicants*.

6. That the opposite doctrine is to be rejected.

On each and all of these we affirm that the doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church is the Scriptural doctrine.

1. *The Sacramental Objects.*—We affirm then that it is a Scriptural doctrine ; That the true body and blood of Christ are the sacramental objects ; that is, that apart from any questions on other points, the true body and true blood of our Lord, are the objects set before us in the sacramental words, and whether their presence be offered to contemplation, to memory, to faith, or after a substantial, supernatural manner, it is the true body and true blood of Christ, of which we are to make our affirmation, or denial, when we state the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

By *true* body, we mean that body in which our Saviour was actually incarnate, as opposed to His mystical body, which is the Church, or any ideal or imaginary body. It is conceded that it was His true body, not His mystical body, which was given for us ; but Christ, in the Lord's Supper, says : "This is My body, *which is given for you* : " therefore the sacramental object is His true body. As neither His mystical body, nor the Holy Spirit dwelling in His body, nor a sign nor symbol of His body, nor a memorial of His body, nor faith in His body, was given for us, but His true body itself was given, it and it alone,

and neither one nor other of all the objects substituted for it, is the first sacramental object.

2. By His true blood, we mean that blood which was the actual seat of His human vitality, that "precious blood" where-with we are bought. It was confessedly His true blood which was shed for the remission of sins; but Christ, in the Lord's Supper, says: "This is My blood, *which is shed* for the remission of sins." Now, as neither a doctrine about His blood, nor the efficacy of His blood, nor the Holy Spirit uniting us with His blood, nor a sign, symbol, nor memorial of His blood, nor faith in His blood was shed for sins, and as His true blood alone was so shed, it, and none other of all the objects substituted for it, is the second sacramental object.

*Corollary a.*—Hence the objection is groundless that our Confession adds to Scripture by saying that Christ's *true* body is the sacramental object, for although that adjective *true*, is not used in the words of the institution, the idea is there, if the body which was broken for us is Christ's true body, and His blood shed for us is true blood. Calvin, and even Zwingle were compelled to concede so much.

*Corollary b.*—Hence also falls to the ground the charge of conflicting representations, when our theologians speak sometimes of the *natural* body, and sometimes of the *glorified* body of Christ as present. Christ's *true* body, His *natural* body, and His *glorified* body, are one and the same body in identity. The words *true* and *natural*, refer to its *essence*; the word *glorified* refers to its *condition*. The *glorification* of His body neither made it cease to be *true* nor *natural*. That is, it was no more an unreal, ideal, or imaginary body, after the glorification than before. It was identically the same body, but with a constant and plenary exercise of glorious properties. What He possessed, but did not ordinarily use in the days of His humiliation, He now constantly and fully exercises, and this new condition is called His glorification. Though His natural and true body is present, its condition is glorified. But though its condition is glorified, it is not in virtue of that glorification but because of, and through its union as one person with God,



that it is present. This presence is *spiritual*, when that word is opposed to carnal, but it is not spiritual, when that word is opposed to true, as if His presence were something wrought by our spirits. His body is a spiritual body, as opposed to the present conditions and limitations of flesh and blood, but it is not spiritual as opposed to real and natural. All the pretended contradictions of our theology vanish when the terms of that theology are taken in the sense in which it uses them.

## II. *The True Presence.*

We affirm it to be a Scriptural doctrine that these sacramental objects, to-wit: the true body and true blood of Jesus Christ, are *truly present* in the Lord's Supper: *Vere adsint—wahrhaftig gegenwartig sei.*

We oppose a true presence, first, to the Zwinglian theory, that the presence of these objects is simply ideal, a presence to our memory or contemplation: secondly to the theory set forth by Bucer in the Tetrapolitan Confession, further elaborated by Calvin, and now generally known as the Calvinistic, to-wit; that the body and blood, are present in efficacy through the working of the Holy Spirit, in the believing elect. In opposition to the first, we affirm it to be Scriptural, that the presence is one wrought not by our ideas, memories, or contemplation, but is a presence equally true, whether we do or do not think, remember, contemplate, or believe. In opposition to the second, we affirm, that the efficacy of Christ's body and blood is not separable from them, but is wrought by them truly present; that this efficacy is direct and personal, not mediated by the Holy Ghost, but by Christ Himself, substantially present; that this presence does not depend for its reality (but alone for its salutary results) upon the faith of the receiver, and that its sole causes are the divine personality, and beneficent will of the Institutor of the Supper. We prove this, first, by the demands of all those types of the old Testament which contemplate Christ as the Paschal Lamb, who is to be present in that nature in which He was slain, not after the shadowy mode of the old dispensation, but after the true mode of the



new, in the New Testament Paschal. It is through His human nature that Christ is our Paschal Lamb sacrificed; and, therefore, it must be through His human nature that Christ our Paschal Lamb, is eaten. If it was not through His Divinity, separate from His humanity, that He was sacrificed upon the Cross, it cannot be that through His divine nature, separate from His humanity, He is given to us at His table. We prove it, secondly, by the demands of the type, of Old Testament sacrifices, which were not only to be offered to God, but to be partaken of by the priests and offerers. That body and blood which were offered to the Father, and by Him accepted, must also be partaken of by those for whom they were offered, and the partaking must be a *true* one, as the offering itself was true—but in order to a true partaking, there must be a true presence.

Thirdly: The words of the institution force us to this conclusion. For if it even be granted for a moment, for argument's sake, that these words might be taken symbolically, the symbol only postpones, by one process, the general result. but by no means sets it aside. A symbol must be the symbol of some real thing; and there must be a point of analogy to constitute a symbol; a sign must point to the reality of which it is the sign; a symbolical act pre-supposes a real corresponding act; and something symbolically done to a symbol implies that something, to which that is analogous is to be, or ought to be really done to a real object. Why, then, is *bread* the symbol of Christ's *body*—not, (as we have already shown), the symbol of a doctrine about that body, or of its efficacy, but of the *body* itself? What is the point of analogy? It must be that both are food. Then Christ's body must be conceded to be true food, or bread cannot be the symbol of it. But if Christ's true body be conceded to be true food, then the symbol has brought us to the acknowledgment of a true presence somewhere—but if there be a true presence anywhere, it will not be denied that it is in the Lord's Supper. Furthermore if bread be the symbol of a true body, breaking bread the symbol of a true breaking of a true body, then the eating of that bread must be the symbol of a true eating of a true body;

but if it be granted that this takes place anywhere, it will not be denied that it takes place in the Lord's Supper. Thus is the theory of the symbol really subversive of itself, unless it be contended that we eat symbolically in the Supper what we eat truly elsewhere, which no one is likely to maintain. The parallelism may be made more obvious by presenting it in a tabular view :

SYMBOL.	REALITY.
1. Bread.	1. True Body.
2. Breaking of Bread.	2. True Breaking of True Body.
3. Eating of Broken Bread.	3. True Eating of True Body truly Broken.
4. Cup, (Contents.)	4. True Blood.
5. Pouring Out.	5. True Blood, truly shed.
6. Drinking.	6. True Drinking of True Blood, truly shed.

But it is impossible, on sound principles of interpretation, to find a symbol in the words of the Institution. The Eucharist combines three characters which forbid such an idea. 1. It is a *Supper*. 2. It is *Testamentary*. 3. It is a *Covenanting Rite*.

1. When at a *Supper* a guest has offered to him anything, with the request to eat, and with assignment of the reason : This is so and so—all laws of language lead us to expect that the thing so offered, shall be, not the sign, symbol, or memorial of that which is to be eaten, but shall be the very thing designated. If the words of the Institution had been : "Jesus said, Take, eat, This is *bread*," would not the man be thought to trifle who would urge that He gave them, not bread, but a sign, symbol, or memorial of bread ? Would he help himself by appealing to interpretations of dreams, to parables, metaphors, figures and symbols ? By no means. Men would ask him for an instance in which at a *Supper*, any one had said : "Take, eat, This is bread," meaning that it was not bread, but a symbol of bread. Who would say, seriously, at a *Supper*, handing a man a book : "Take, eat, This is sponge cake," meaning

that as a sponge cake is light and pleasant to the body, so is the book of which it is a symbol, a light work, and pleasant to the mind? Why is it that the Supper of our Lord stands separate in the world in this, that in it alone, in any sense, symbolical or sacramental, imaginary or real, the guests are invited to participate in the body of Him of whom it is the memorial? Does not this fact alone demonstrate that Christ's body is solitary in its powers and relations to men; that language in regard to it belongs to a wholly different sphere from that which pertains to the bodies of other men; that we can affirm of it what would be worse than blasphemy, what would be incoherent raving if made in regard to any but Christ? Would any man at a supper, devoted to the memory of Washington, offer bread, and say: "Take, eat, This is Washington's body?" Would he use such language at all, or if he did, could he mean thereby that the spirit of Washington, or his principles, or the efficacy of the work he had wrought through his body, are the support of our civil life, as bread supports the natural life? These suppositions look so monstrous that we can hardly think of them gravely as they really are, that is as actual parallels to the mode of interpretation substituted for that of our Church, by men who pronounce our doctrine unscriptural. It is not overstating the fact to declare that as a question of the laws of language, apart from philosophical speculation or doctrinal system, the meaning of the words: "Take, eat, This is My body," are as clear as any passage from Genesis to Revelation. Dr. Hodge says that the words have been the subject of an immense amount of controversy, but so have been the clear words which teach the Trinity, the Divinity of our Lord, the eternity of future punishments; not that they are not clear, but that men will not admit them in their obvious sense. A doctrine is not proved to be disputable, simply because it is disputed.

Finally, to put this point in a just light, suppose that our Lord at the Supper, had said: "Take, eat, This is bread," and that men had arisen, who, in the face of this clear testimony, had said it was not bread of which He spoke, but His body and His body only, how would the patrons of the Zwinglian

theory, which in that case would have been related to the words supposed, as the Lutheran view now is, to the words used, how would they have received such an interpretation? They would have received it with astonishment and reprobation, just as their own interpretation deserves to be regarded, when our Lord Jesus, stating what is that very thing for the reception of which the Supper was instituted, says: "Take, eat, this is *My body*." If our Master's words would have been clear according to the laws of language, in the terms we have for illustration's sake, supposed Him to have used, then equally clear, according to the same laws, are the words which He did use. He who believes that the words *supposed* would have proved that our Lord desired to communicate to His disciples *bread*, must believe, if he is consistent, that the words He actually *used* prove that He desired to communicate to them His *body*. If he objects to the latter inference, then his objection is derived not from the laws of language, but from philosophical or rationalistic principles, which he is determined, shall override the clear word. Hence, we repeat the thought, and close this part of the argument with it, that the meaning of the terms of the Institution, as a pure question of language, is as clear as the meaning of any part of the Word of God—and that meaning is the one which our Church accepts and confesses. If the absolute authority of God's word stands, the sacramental doctrine of our Church stands, for if it be incontrovertible that it is unsound to interpret, "This is bread," as meaning, "This is *not* bread, but is *My body* only," it is equally incontrovertible, that it is unsound to interpret, "This is *My body*," as meaning, "This is *not My body*, but bread only."

2. The words of the Eucharist are also Testamentary—they are the *Words of the Will* of our Lord who is about to die, and who invests His heirs with that whose possession gave them all that He desired to secure to them. But who ever heard of a *will* which bequeathed signs or symbols—not real possessions to the heirs? If a will were produced in which the Testator had said: It is my wish and will that M. N. should have such and such a tract of land and so many thousand dollars; and when M. N.

came to claim land and money, he was told that this "tract of land" was a sign or symbol of the Heavenly Canaan, which is the home of the soul as an earthly tract of land may be the residence of the body; and that the thousands of dollars were simply a sign of incorruptible treasures in the other world; and that the testator meant only that it was his wish and will that M N. should have these good things of the other world, would he consider this sound interpretation? When Christ gives us Himself, He gives us everything. His body and blood are the organs of His Deity. In giving them to us He gives all to us; but in giving to us the mere signs of them, He would give us very little. All bread is as such equally a symbol of His body; all wine is a symbol of His blood. Give us but these symbols at His Testamentary Supper, and we have at the Lord's Supper only what we may have at every meal. What we want is Christ Himself, not symbols of Him.

But were the case less clear in regard to the Testamentary words, were it possible with equal propriety to embrace a strict or a loose acceptation of them, still the law holds good, that where a dispute arises in which it is impossible to settle which one of two meanings is the correct one, the preference shall be given to the more literal of the two; and this rule is good here. If we run the risk of erring, let it be by believing our Lord too far, too closely, too confidingly, rather than by doubting or by trying to explain away the natural import of His words.

3. The Lord's Supper is a Covenanting Institution. But in a Covenant as in a Testament, the things mutually conveyed and received are not the signs nor symbols of things, but things themselves. Whenever, as in the case of a will, disputes arise as to a literal or a laxer meaning, that interpretation, other things being equal, is always safest which adheres most closely to the very letter of the terms.

But the character of the covenanting words is yet further settled by their obvious allusion to the terms of the Old Covenant. "Moses took the blood of calves and of goats, and sprinkled both the books and all the people, saying: This is the blood of the Testament which God hath appointed unto you."

It is with these words in His mind our Lord says: "This is *My* blood (not the blood of calves and of goats) of the *New* Testament," (not of the Old.) Surely if in the forming of the Old Covenant, which is a covenant of shadows, types and symbols, there was true blood, not the sign or symbol of blood, much more in the forming of the New Covenant, which is one of body, substance, and reality, we have not the symbol of blood, but the true blood of the great sacrifice.

4. Let us now look for a moment at the words of the Institution singly. "Take, eat; this is My body given for you." The Lutheran Church confesses that each word in this sentence is to be understood literally. The taking is a true taking, the eating a true eating. "This" means this—this which I tell you to take, this which I tell you to eat, this is, truly is, "My body," My true body truly given for My disciples. How have those who favored a symbolical interpretation evaded the natural force of these words?

Against a sense so natural, so direct, so universally received by the Holy Church of all ages, in its great assertion of an objective presence of Christ's body and blood, its opponents were bound to produce, not merely as probable a sense, but one more probable. They were bound in undertaking to shake the faith of Christendom, to produce an interpretation capable of a clear statement, and of invincible proofs. They were morally bound to have some agreement as to what was to be substituted for the received interpretation, and by what principles its necessity was to be demonstrated from God's word. This they have attempted for nearly three centuries and a half, and up to this hour the failure has been total in every respect. They are as far as ever from a fixed sense of the words, or a principle by which the sense can ever be fixed. There is no position midway between the implicit acceptance of the literal sense, and the chaos of eternal doubt.

The first view which was arrayed against that of our church was the view of Carlstadt. He admitted the literal force of every term in the Institution, and interpreted thus: The Saviour said, Take, eat, and came to a full pause. Then pointing

with His finger to His body, He uttered as a distinct proposition, "This body is My body." It is hardly necessary to add that so preposterous an interpretation found few friends.

The word TAKE these interpreters have usually construed literally, though why an imaginary body or the symbol of a body might not be taken mentally, they cannot say. Men do not open doors, because a door is a symbol of Christ: why should they take and eat bread because it is a symbol of His body? A symbol is addressed to the mind; it derives its being and takes its shape from the mind of the user, and is intellectually received by the person to whom it is addressed. The mere symbol cannot be so identified with its object, as that an inference from the object is logically applicable to the symbol, or from the symbol, logically applicable to the object. We cannot say of one door more than another, "That door is Christ," but still less could we draw an inference from the symbol to the object, or from the object to the symbol.

The symbolic theory, even were we to grant its assumption, can give no intelligible reason for the statement, "*This* bread is My body. *This* cup is My blood," for as a symbol, This bread is no more Christ's body than any other bread; as one lamb, one vine, or one shepherd, is no more a symbol of Christ than another. The symbol is founded on the common quality of the thing symbolizing; the innocence of all lambs, the nutritious character of all bread, the means of access furnished by every door. It is evident that as it is only after Christ blessing the bread, that it is true that "This," which He now commands us to "Take, eat," is His body—and that this bread was just as much a symbol of His body before the blessing as after it, was and is, just as much a symbol out of the sacrament as in it—that the "this" cannot refer to the bread merely, nor can the bread in the Supper, be no more than a symbol. There is true body and true bread, so related that the true bread is the medium of the sacramental communion of the true body, and for this reason only could it be true, that "*this*" bread, more than any other, could be called the body of our Lord.



The word EAT they have interpreted literally, though why the eating ought not to be done symbolically or mentally, to correspond with the symbolical or mental character of the body, they cannot say. Certainly there are plenty of instances of a figurative use of the word "Eat," while there are none of such a use of the word "is." The Quakers are more consistent.

The word "THIS," they have interpreted variously. The renowned Schwenckfeld gets at its meaning by reading the Saviour's words backwards thus: My body is this, that is, My body is bread—nourishes the soul as real bread nourishes the body. That is he makes the subject "this," the predicate; and the predicate "My body," the subject. Those who have entered the lists against the doctrine of our Church, usually insist that "this" qualifies "bread," that is, that the pronoun *touto*, which is neuter, qualifies the noun which is masculine. Determined to be fettered by no laws of language, they abrogate the rule—that a pronoun shall agree with the noun it qualifies in gender.

Some theologians who have attacked the faith of our church, have, in order to make their work easy, been pleased to invent arguments and positions for her. They have, of course, been able to do with their imaginary arguments for her what they could not do with her real arguments for herself. They have found that upsetting the men of straw, of their own making, was very different from uprooting the everlasting foundations of the temple reared by God.

One of these weak inventions is, that our church adopts this ungrammatical construction of a neuter pronoun with a masculine noun, and that hence she after all deserts the literal sense of the word, and that her interpretation really is: "This (bread) is not My body, but *in, with, and under* it My body is given." But as the church does not consider the neuter pronoun as qualifying the masculine noun, and does not interpolate the word bread, but takes our Lord's words precisely as He utters them, all this ingenuity is thrown away. It only shows how she might have argued, had she possessed as little grammar, as little logic, and as little reverence for her Master's

words as is exhibited by such antagonists. From the words: "This is My body," she only gathers this: "This is Christ's body;" and neither on the one hand that the bread is not His body, nor on the other that His body is given in, with, and under it. She acknowledges that the *ecclesiastical* (not Biblical) phrase "*This bread is Christ's body,*" sets forth a truth, as the Church uses and understands it; and from a comparison of text with text, she knows that the bread is the medium by which, in which, with which, under which the body is imparted, but she reaches this by no reading out of the text what is in it, nor reading into it, what is no part of it; but by interpreting every word, in that natural and proper sense, which is fixed by the laws of language. Our Saviour says, Take, and we take; He says, Eat, and we eat; He says: This (which He has just told us to take, eat) is My body, and we believe it. The affirmation is as literal as the command, and we believe the one as we obey the other, to the letter, no more understanding His affirmation to be, This is *not* My body, than we understand His command to be, Do *not* take, Do *not* eat.

"*My body,*" some have interpreted to mean "symbol of My body," but as this would make the Saviour say that "the symbol of His body" not His body itself, was given for us, the symbol of His blood not His blood itself was shed for us, this view is generally abandoned. It was the view of Œcolampadius, the Melancthon of Zwingle in the Swiss Reformation, but far greater than his master. He was too good a scholar to be ignorant that the metaphor, if there be one, must lie in one of the nouns connected, and not in the substantive verb which connects them. As the bread was indubitably literal bread, he saw that he must either make "body" metaphorical, or abandon the idea of metaphor. The later divines of this general school rejected this theory with an earnestness which shows that they were ashamed of it. Thus BEZA:\* "The words which follow, to wit, 'which is given for you' and 'which is shed for you,' compel us to understand the words of the very substance

\* Epis. 5, ad Alaman. III. 202, and Adv. Illyricum, 217.

itself of the body and blood of Christ." "We do not doubt that by the term body is meant that very body which was assumed for our sakes and crucified." This view of Beza, was indeed the view of the whole body of Calvinistic theologians, with few and inconsiderable exceptions. The sole refuge left, therefore, for the disputer of the doctrine of our Church, is in the word "is." The word "is," Zwingle\* and those who follow him, say means "represents, is a symbol of." Hence they draw the inference that our Saviour means: "This [bread] [represents, is a symbol of] My body." Because then it is to be a symbol of His broken body, He breaks this bread, and because it is to be a symbol of His body given, He gives this bread, and because it is to be a symbol of His body taken, they take this bread—and what then?—because it is to be a symbol of His body eaten, they eat this bread. The symbol does not help its friends very far nor very long.

We have shown, that the laws of language forbid the application of the symbol here, even if the words in the abstract would allow of it. We now go farther, and maintain that the word "is," cannot have the sense of "signify or be a symbol of." We prove this,

1st. By the fact that no translations, ancient or modern, with any pretension to character so render the word. We as-

---

\* Zwingle did not originate this interpretation. He adopted it, from Honius, a contemporary whose name is now almost forgotten. Zwingle's account of the growth of his own theory is very interesting. He says: "I saw that the words: 'This is my body,' are figurative, but I did not see in what word the figure lay. At this point, by the grace of God, it happened that two learned and pious men, came to consult on this matter; and when they heard our opinion (for they had concealed their own, for it was not then safe to express opinions on the subject freely) they thanked God and gave me in an untied package the letter of a learned and pious Hollander (Honius). In it I found this precious pearl, that 'is' here means 'signifies.' When we were compelled to explain our opinions openly it seemed more discreet, to open with that key, the word in which the figure lies, than simply to say: It is a figure."—(*Opera, Turic.*, 1832. Vol. III. 606.)

This frank history shows that Zwingle framed his theory first, and cherished it for some time before he could see how the Word of God was to be harmonized with it. Even when he came to see that "is" means "signifies," he could find no evidence of it, till it was revealed to him in that extraordinary vision of the man of dubious color, which was so mercilessly ridiculed in the Old Controversies.

sert, after a careful examination of all of those that have most reputation, that not one so translates the word, whether they originate in the Eastern, Western, Lutheran or Reformed Churches. No man of character has ever dared to insert into the text of his translation: *This is a symbol of My body.*

2d. No impartial dictionary of the Greek, whether general or New Testament, assigns such a meaning to the word. Where such a meaning is assigned, it is manifestly for the very purpose of promoting this false view, for doctrinal reasons.

3d. No good dictionary of the English assigns such a meaning to the English verb "to be;" no good dictionary of the Hebrew or of any language of which we know anything, assigns such a meaning to the verb corresponding in each with our verb to be, or with the Greek *Eimi*.

4th. The expositors and dogmaticians who, for philosophical or theological reasons, have been forced to maintain that the word "is" means "is a symbol of," have utterly failed to produce a *solitary instance* in which the word is so used.

Let us look at some of the passages that have been cited to prove that "is" may mean "is a symbol of." Passages such as these are favorites: "*I am* the vine, ye *are* the branches." "*I am* the door." "*I am* the bread of life." But if the word "is" means "is a symbol of," then Christ would say: "*I am the symbol* of a vine," "*I am the symbol* of a door," "*I am the symbol* of bread," which is absurd.

Nor do such passages as 1 Cor. x. 4, help the symbolical theory at all: "They all drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed (or went with them): and that Rock was Christ." The meaning of that passage is, that the real spiritual Rock which attended them was the manifested Jehovah, that is, the second person of the Trinity, Christ Himself in His pre-existent state. God is a rock; God is our true support; our true support is God. The resolution into the literal lies in the word rock, not in the word "is." So when we say, Christ *is* the door, the vine, the foundation, the corner-stone, the resolution of the expression into what is absolutely literal, turns not upon the word "is," but on the word "door," "vine," or

other noun, as the case may be. If you take Webster's Dictionary, or any other good dictionary, you will not find that the substantive verb "to be," means to signify, but you will find that the fifth meaning given to the word door is, "means of approach;" and you will find as proof of the meaning, it quotes: "I am the door; by Me if any man enter in, he shall be saved." But if when we say, Christ *is* the door, we do not mean Christ is the symbol of the door, neither can we mean when we say, the door is Christ, that the door is the symbol of Christ. We mean in the one case, that Christ is really and truly, not symbolically, the door—that is, He is the real means of approaching God; and in the other, that the true and real means of approach, the real door, is truly (not symbolizes) Christ. When I point to a particular door, and say, that door *is a symbol of* Christ, the word door is literal, and means a door of wood; but when I say the door is Christ, the word door is not taken literally, but the word *is* must be so taken. Christ is the vine, the vine is Christ—Christ is not a symbol of the vine, but is the true vine itself; the true vine is not a symbol of Christ, but is Christ. We say that Washington was the pillar of his country, or the pillar of our country was Washington; no more meaning that the pillar was a symbol of Washington, than that Washington was the symbol of a pillar; but meaning that Washington was the true pillar of our country, and that the true pillar of our country was Washington; the word pillar meaning in each case a support. We could not lay hold of a literal pillar and say: Lean on this, trust in this; this is that General Washington who fought for our country. We could not bring a man a vine and say: Attach yourself to this vine; this is Christ: or direct him to a particular door, and say: Go through, enter in, this door is Christ.

There is no parallel in the interpretation of dreams. "The three branches (are) three days." Gen. xl. 12. "The seven good kine (are) seven years, and the seven good ears (are) seven years." Gen. xli. 26. "The seven thin kine (are) seven years of famine." 1. There is no "are" in the origi-

nal. 2. The "branches," "kine," and "ears" are not real branches, real kine, nor real ears, but the ideals of a dream. It is not three branches, but the three branches of the dream that are three days. The seven dream-branches, dream-kine, and dream-ears are, to speak literally—to drop the idea of a dream—seven years. 3. If "is," in interpreting a dream, and because it so interprets, meant "signifies," it would have no bearing on the Lord's Supper, which is not the interpretation of a dream. 4. "The seven empty ears *shall be* seven years of famine." Does that mean "shall signify," as if they did not equally signify then? or does it mean that the empty ears, if we express what they really are and are to be, shall be "seven years of famine"? 5. Would the inference be justifiable from this dream, that: Take, eat; these are seven ears prepared for your food—means that there were no ears, but only symbols of ears? Pluck and strip; these are branches covered with delicious fruit—that there were no branches, no fruit, but symbols of them? If it would not, there is no parallel.

Nor does the passage on which Zwingle dwelt as the decisive one opened to him in a dream, by a spirit too flitting to leave a trace of his color, support the sagacity of the spirit. It would heighten the probability of his having any of the hues of pearls or help the exegesis of his sore-pressed friend. *Exod. xii. 11*: "It (*is*) the Lord's Passover."

Zwingle assumes that "it" means "the lamb," and that the sentence consequently results: "The lamb is the Passover," that is, the lamb signifies, or is the sign of the Passover.

But 1: The word "is," is not there. 2: The "it," does not refer to the lamb—but to the whole transaction which takes place with girded loins, and the eating of the lamb. The "it" is used indefinitely, as if we would say, "Let us gather round the cheerful hearth, let us light up the children's tree, for it is Christmas." The reason of the name "Passover," follows in the twelfth verse. "It is the Lord's Passover. For I will pass through the land." What sense is there in the words: The lamb is a symbol of the Passover, for I will pass through

it?" 3: In no sense in which the word "Passover" could hold, whether in the act of angelic transition, or the feast instituted to commemorate it, could the lamb signify, or be a symbol of it. The lamb was that whose body was literally slain, and whose blood was literally shed, in making the Passover Covenant. It was not a symbol of the passing over of the angel, for there is no analogy between a slain lamb and a passing over. It was not a symbol of the Feast of the Passover, but the chief material of the feast. Nor was the lamb a memorial of the original passing over. The Passover feast itself, as a whole was. Nor was the lamb a memorial of this feast, but simply a chief element in it. 4: The word "Passover" here means the festival. Not the transition itself. 5: If the lamb could be called the Passover feast, it would be so called. Not because it signified the feast, but because the feast was made on it. 6: If the words were, 'Take, eat, this is the body of the Paschal Lamb slain for you,' could Zwingle's interpretation of the verse in question overthrow the literal meaning of "is" in them? If not there is no parallel.

The allegory seems no better as a parallel. The allegory leads us into a world, where a being or thing is the designed ideal representative of another. The bundle on Christians back, is the burden of sin. The lions are terrors in the way. Vanity Fair is the godless world, the dark river is death—that is, says the slovenly interpreter, signifies or is a sign of. Now an actual burden in real life, may be a symbol of a spiritual burden; living lions may be symbols of the terrible, a real river a symbol of death, but the bundle, lions, river of the allegory are as ideal as the symbol. In an allegory, moreover, the framer has the reality in his mind before the ideal representative. The real is throughout the *subject*, the allegorical representative the *predicate*. Hence to put in their proper attitude both as to time and logical relation, we should say the burden of sin, is the bundle on Christian's back; the terrors are the lions; death is the dark river. That is the meaning even in the inverted order in which we first put them—but the burden of sin is not the symbol of a bundle—death not the symbol



of a river. Hence the structure of an allegory, not only does not sustain the Zwinglian interpretation of the words of the institutor but overthrows it—for it demonstrates that the subject is not the symbol of the predicate, but Zwingle's theory assumes that it is. But were it otherwise the Lord's Supper is no allegory.

A more dangerous falsity in interpretation, than the assumption that the word "is" may be explained in the sense of "signify," or "be a symbol of," is hardly conceivable. Almost every doctrine of the Word of God will melt under it. "The Word *was* God" would mean, "The Word signified, was a symbol of God." "God is a Spirit," would mean, "God is the symbol of a Spirit." When it is said of Jesus Christ: "This is the true God," it would mean that He is the symbol or image of the true God. By it Christ would cease to be the way, the truth, and the life, and would be a mere symbol of them; would no longer be the door, the vine, the Good Shepherd, the Bishop of Souls, but would be the symbol of a door, the sign of a vine, the figure of a shepherd, the representation of a Bishop. This characteristic of the use of "is" is essential to the very morality of language, and language itself would commit suicide if it could tolerate the idea that the substantive verb shall express not substance but symbol. Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification would all fuse and be dissipated in the crucible of this species of interpretation. It would take the Bible from us, and lay upon our breasts, cold and heavy, a Swedenborgian night-mare of correspondences. The Socinian, and the Pelagian, and all errorists of all schools, would triumph in the throwing of everything into hopeless confusion, and the Infidel would feel that the Book he has so long feared and hated, deprived, as it now would be, of its vitality by the trick of interpreters, could, henceforth, be safely regarded with contempt.

Well might Luther write upon the table at Marburg: "This is My body;" simple words, framed by infinite wisdom, so as to resist the violence and all the ingenuity of men. Rationalism in vain essays to remove them with its cunning, its learning, and its philosophy. Fanaticism gnashes its teeth at them

in vain. They are an immovable foundation for faith in the Sacramental mystery, and the gates of hell cannot shake the faith of the Church, that our Lord Jesus with the true body and true blood which He gave for our redemption on the Cross, is truly present in the Holy Supper, to *apply* the redemption through the very organs by which it was *wrought out*. The sacrifice was made once for all—its application goes on to the end of time. The offence of the Master's Cross now rests upon His table, and thither the triumph of the Cross shall follow it. On the Cross and at the table the saints discern the body of the Lord, and in simple faith are determined to know in both nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

### III. *The Species of Bread and Wine.*

*Transubstantiation; Romanism; and Rationalism.*

The Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession declares that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present in the Supper "UNDER THE FORM (*unter der Gestalt*) OF BREAD AND WINE." The word "form" and the German word "*Gestalt*," which it translates, are renderings, confessedly, of the Latin term "species." The Apology (164, 54, 57: *illis rebus quæ videntur, sichtbaren Dingen*), giving an equivalent of the word "species" or "form" defines it, "those things which are seen, the visible things, bread and wine," and the Formula of Concord (674, 126) speaks of "the elements or visible species or form of the consecrated bread and wine." The word "species" belongs to the common terms of Theology, and is used by Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Zwinglian authors. It is used, for example, in the articles of the Marburg Colloquy, which were signed by Zwingle. In classic Latin "species" not only means "a form," but "an object presented to the sight"; not only "figure," but the "nature of a thing." It also has the meaning "kind," hence the phrase "communion in both kinds," "both species." So in English we use the words "species" and "kind" as convertible.

The emphasis in the Tenth Article is not on the word *species*, but on *bread and wine*—not as if it meant the *species*, not the

reality; but, on the contrary, the species or kinds of *true bread* and *true wine*, not of the *accidents* of them. In a word, it asserts that the visible objects in the Lord's Supper are real bread and real wine. The doctrine of the Confession is that the visible and earthly *element* in the Lord's Supper is *true bread* and *true wine* (not their *accidents*), as the invisible and heavenly element is the body and blood of Christ (not their *symbols*, nor the *memory* of them, nor their *spiritual virtue*).

The words, *FIRST OF ALL*, reject the doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

*SECONDLY*: They repudiate the Romish doctrine of *sacramental concomitance*, to wit: that because of their *natural association*, or *concomitance*, both the body and blood of Christ are given, with each of the species *sacramentally*, that is, with the bread both body and blood are given *sacramentally*, and with the wine both blood and body are given *sacramentally*. The confession implies that the body only is given *sacramentally* by the bread. The blood only is *sacramentally* given by the wine. That from a natural concomitance we cannot argue to a *sacramental* one, for the *sacramental* is wholly supernatural, and its character depends on the will of Christ who has appointed one species for the *sacramental* impartation of His body, the other for the *sacramental* impartation of His blood.

*THIRDLY*: In this the confession implies that the two species or kinds, bread and wine, must both be used in order to having a complete communion, and thus the doctrine is set forth, which involves a rejection of the Romish abuse of the denial of the cup, which applies not only to the laity, but to the *communicant*, whether lay or priestly. The priestly offerer of the *sacrifice* of the mass drinks of the cup, in making the *sacrifice*, but when the same man approaches the table as a communicant, he receives only the bread.

*FOURTHLY*: In limiting the presence of the body and blood first to the communicants (*vescentibus*) and secondly, to the Lord's Supper, (*adsint in Cæna*) the confession implies that nothing has a sacramental character apart from its sacramental use: That the presence of the body and blood of Christ is such

that only the communicants can actualize it—it is not a presence for mice and worms, but for man: and that this presence is limited to the Supper: The body and blood of Christ cannot be reserved, laid up in monstrances, or carried in procession.

FIFTHLY: In this denial of a change of the elements, and in the maintenance, that the presence is, one to be actualized, *solely* by the *sacramental eating and drinking*, is involved the rejection of the doctrine, that the species in the Supper are to be worshiped, or that Christ Himself is to be worshiped as in the species. We can and should worship Christ at His table, but precisely as we worship Him away from it. He did not say, Take, Worship, but: Take, eat. He did not say, this is My Divinity, but this is My body, and the bread which we break is not the shrine of His Deity, but the "Communion of His body."

On the FIRST of these points as conditioning all the rest, we shall dwell more fully than on the others.

The word "Transubstantiation" was as unknown to pure antiquity as the doctrine couched under it. It first appears in the Twelfth Century. The first official use of the term was made in the Lateran Council of 1215. The doctrine of Transubstantiation affirms that at the consecrating words the substance of bread and wine ceases to be, and in their place, clothed with their accidents or properties, are the body, blood, soul, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; no bread, no wine, but simply Christ's body, looking like bread, tasting like bread, feeling like bread, nourishing the body like bread, corrupted like bread, eaten by mice like bread, conjoined with poison killing the body like poisoned bread, bearing on it the baker's mark like bread; but no bread, only body; that there is no wine, but Christ's blood smelling like wine, red if the wine have been red, white if the wine have been white, intoxicating like wine, spilling like wine, leaving permanent stains like wine, poisoning if mixed with poison like poisoned wine, pronounced by chemical analysis to be wine, depositing the acids and salts like wine, but throughout no wine.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation is a doctrine not only un-

taught in the Scriptures, but directly in conflict with their letter. It is in conflict with the analogy of faith, overthrowing logically indubitable parts of the faith; it is in conflict with the nature of a sacrament, to which are required two real elements, the real earthly as well as the real heavenly; it is in conflict with a fair parallel with Holy Baptism, in which it is not pretended by the Church of Rome that there is any transubstantiation of the water; it is a doctrine utterly unknown to Christian antiquity, the demonstrable invention of ages of corruption, resisted by many of the greatest theologians even under the Papacy, and the nurse of superstition, and of the grossest idolatry; it is in conflict with the testimony of the senses, subversive of all the laws of moral evidence, and by overstressing faith into credulity, tends to produce by reaction, universal skepticism. An acute nation which swings into Transubstantiation, swings out of it into Atheism.

This Doctrine of the mediæval Church of Rome was very early and very positively rejected by Luther, and our other great Reformers. In 1520, Luther, in his book on the Babylonish Captivity, says: "For more than twelve hundred years the Church held the right faith," (in regard to the Lord's Supper,) "and never do the holy *fathers* make mention of that *portentous word* and *dream*, Transubstantiation." In 1522, in his book against Henry VIII., he says, "What they (the Romanists) hold in regard to *Transubstantiation* is the merest *figment* of the godless and blind Thomists;" and again, "I declare it to be *impious* and *blasphemous* for any one to assert that the bread is transubstantiated." It were easy, if need were, to fill pages with testimony of this kind; but it is needless.

The Romanists, in their Confutation, objected to the Tenth Article that it does not teach Transubstantiation, and, what they there say, or what was said by their great theological representatives at the Diet, is most important as showing how the Confession was there understood, and, of course, how it is to be understood now.

An examination of their official Confutation at once silences the pitiful old libel that the Roman Catholics accepted the Tenth

Article *without reservation*. The latest repeater of this ignorant if not malicious assertion, is Rev. Wm. Good, by whom it has been the great misfortune of the Low Church Party in England to seem to be represented. He quotes, at second hand, we judge, (from the pages of one of the bitterest zealots against the Lutheran Church), four words, drawn from the Papal Confutation, which would lead his readers to suppose that the Papists simply assented to the Tenth Article as being sound, and hence he draws the inference that the Article teaches the Romish view. All this is built on an isolation of four words out of more than a hundred. The Romish Confutation, so far as it bears upon this point, literally translated, runs thus :

"The Tenth Article *in words* offends nothing, when they confess that in the Eucharist after consecration legitimately made, the body and blood of Christ are substantially and truly present, *provided that (si modo)* they believe, that under *each species*, the entire Christ is present, so that by *concomitance*, the blood of Christ is no less under the species of bread than it is under the species of wine, and so of the other. Otherwise in the Eucharist, the body of Christ would be bloodless, contrary to St. Paul, that Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more.—Rom. vi.

"*One thing is to be added as an Article exceedingly necessary (valide necessarium,) to this Confession, that they shall believe the Church, (rather than some who falsely teach otherwise), that by the omnipotent Word of God, in the consecration of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread is changed into the body of Christ.*"

Here it is clear, first, that so far as the Romanists give their approval at all to the Tenth Article, it is of the most reserved kind. First, they speak of the "words" only, as not offensive on the one point that there is a true presence. It is the only case in which they qualify their approval by terms which imply a suspicion that "the words" may not fairly convey what is meant. Hoffmeister indeed expresses this insinuation, "unless, indeed they wish to impose upon us by a likeness of words."

Second, They declare that even these words are not offen-



sive, solely, if they be so interpreted as to include the idea of concomitance, which it is not pretended they express; they carefully note that the Article *does not teach Transubstantiation*, in this acknowledging that that doctrine is not implied as has been pretended, in the word "species." In fact as the Confession does not teach concomitance, but by implication rejects it, the Romish Confutation does not really endorse heartily a single word of it.

The discussion of the Tenth Article by John Cochläus, sheds no less light on the understanding of the Article by the Romanists at the time. This bitter enemy of the Reformation, who was one of those who drew up the Confutation, says: "Though that Article be brief, *there are many things of which we complain as wanting in it, (multa tamen in eo desideramus)*. Luther frivolously denying Transubstantiation, though in words he disputes at large against Zwingle and Ecolampadius, *yet in the thing itself*, he thinks with them, and is in collusion with them, (*cum eis colludit*). And Luther's followers have reached such a pitch of madness, that they *refuse longer to adore the Eucharist*, because Luther has impiously taught that it is safer not to adore, and has openly *denied the doctrine of concomitance*. And now they have proceeded in the fury of their impiety to such a degree as to deny that the body of Christ remains in the consecrated Host, except in the use at the altar, (*extra altaris usum*.) Hence they falsely and impiously call us idolaters, because we retain the body of the Lord in the consecrated Host in the Tabernacles, (*Cibarius*), for infirm Communicants, or when we bear it (the body) about in monstrances and processions." He quotes Melancthon's words in the Apology, "with those things which are seen, the bread and wine," as flagrantly contradictory of Transubstantiation, (*turpiter contradicit sibi ipsi*).\*

\* On the History and Literature of the Papal Confutation, which has great value in the interpretation and defence of the Augsburg Confession, see the works following:

BRILL auf d. evangel. Augapfel, 1629. 4, (the German translation of the work of Fabricius Leodius mentioned below).

DANZ: Augsburg Confess., Jena, 1829. 12mo. § 6.



In this connection it is worth noticing that, widely as Romanism, with its Transubstantiation, and Rationalism, with its Symbol, differ in their results, they run into their error by the same fallacious principle of interpretation—each applying it with the same arbitrariness, but to different objects.

The Romanist wishes to do away with the Scripture testimony in regard to the bread and wine; and, although they bear their name *before* the Lord's Supper, *during* the Lord's Supper, and *after* the Lord's Supper, he insists that there is neither bread nor wine there, but only their accidents. While our Lord says: "This is my body," the Romanist in effect makes it: This seeming bread is no longer bread, but has become, has been transubstantiated into My body. He deserts the letter and reaches Transubstantiation.

The Rationalist wishes to retain the bread and wine, and therefore holds that what the Scripture *calls* bread and wine,

---

CHYTREUS. Hist. Aug. Conf., 119. (Confutation, 173, seq.) Ger. Edit., 1577, p. 191.

CELESTINUS I. 192 seq. Confutation III.

CYPRIAN. 87, seq.

FEUERLIN: Biblioth Symbol.

FICKENSCHER: Gesch. d. Reichst. z. Augsburg, 1830, III. 324.

FOERSTEMANN: ÜRKUNDEBUCH, 2 vols. 8vo. Halle, 1835, II. 133-176.

FRANCK: Lib. Symb. Eccl. Luth. Lips. 1847. 12mo. Proleg. xxx-xxxiii. (Confutation, Append. 43-69.

GARLER: Nat. Theol. Jour., 1801, 443 seq.

HASE: Lib. Symb. Eccles. Evangel. Lips. 1827. 2 vols. 12mo. Proleg. lxxiv-lxxvi. The Confutation, lxxvi-cxiv.

HOFFMANN: Comment, in A. C. Tubing., 1727. 4to. 205-213.

KÖLLNER: Symb. d. Luther. Kirche. Hamb. 1837, p. 397-416.

MÜLLER, C. C.: Formulae Confutationis A. C. Lat. Germ. Lips., 1808, 8vo.

MÜLLER, J. J.; Hist. v. Protest u. A. C. Jena, 1705, 4to. p. 653.

PFÄFF: Lib. Symbol Eccl. Luth.

PLANCK: Protest. Lehrbeg. III. I. 52 seq.

ROTERMUND; Gesch. d. z Augsburg. übergeb. Glaubensbek. Hannov. 1829, 8vo. 109-116.

SALIG: I. 224 seq. 378 seq.

SECKENDORF: Hist. Luth. II. 171.

SEMLER: Apparat: in L. S. p. 73.

SPIKER, C. G: Conf. Fidel. Confutation. &c. Berlin, 1830. 8vo. 149-204.

WALCH, J. G: Introd. in L. S. 416. Miscellan. Sacra. 205.

WEBER: Krit. Gesch. II. Vorred., and p. 439.

is bread and wine ; but he wishes to do away with the Scripture testimony in regard to the body and blood ; and although the Scripture says, that of that which the Saviour tells them to Take, eat, He declares most explicitly, This is My body ; and of that which He tells them to drink, He says, This is My blood—though it says that the bread is the communion of His body and the cup the communion of His blood—though it declares that the guilt of the heedless communicant is that he does not “discern the Lord's body,” and that he that eateth and drinketh unworthily is guilty of the body and blood of Christ ; in the face of all this he insists that there is in the Lord's Supper only the shadow, image, or sign of the body and blood of Christ, not the true body and true blood. With what face can a Rationalist meet a Romanist, or a Romanist meet a Rationalist ? No wonder that the Rationalist, after all, is less violent against Romanism than against the pure doctrine of our Church. There is the secret affinity of error between them ; and Romanism does not so hate Rationalism, Rationalism does not so hate Romanism, as both hate unswerving fidelity to the Word of God.

That the Romish and rationalizing modes of interpretation are nearer to each other than either is to the Lutheran, is admitted by both Rationalists and Romanists. The rationalizing interpreters make it one of the common-places of objection to the Lutheran view, that it has *less* in a literal interpretation of the Scripture to sustain it than the Romish view has : that is, the Romish view is less decisively opposed than the Lutheran is, to rationalistic modes of literal interpretation.

On the Romish side Bellarmine and others take the ground that right principles of interpretation lead either to Romanistic or Calvinistic views of the Supper. As both these have the common ground that the proposition of the Supper is : “This bread is Christ's body,” and as both argue that real bread cannot be real body, the one escapes the difficulty by maintaining that there is no real bread in the Supper, the other that there is no real body there ; or, in other words, the Romanist, Zwinglian, and Calvinist agree in an exegetical principle, and simply vary in the application of it.

A single citation from two great authorities, the first Roman Catholic, the second Calvinistic, will demonstrate this. BELLARMINE in his Discussion of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, ch. XIX. says, "These words: 'This is My body,' necessarily lead to the inference either that there is a *true mutation of the bread*, as the CATHOLICS will have it, or a *metaphorical mutation*, as the CALVINISTS will have it; but in no way admit of the LUTHERAN view."

URSINUS, in his Explanation of the Catechism, II., Q. 78: "As it is not true that the Papists retain the verbally literal, so it is *much less true* (*multo minus verum*) that those (Lutherans) retain the letter and true sense of the words." "The letter is: 'This, that is, this bread, is My body;' the meaning is, 'That visible, broken, and distributed bread is My true and essential body'—not by essential conversion, but mystically or by sacramental metonymy, because the words according to the verbally literal, have a sense repugnant to the verity of the Christian faith: therefore we say, that in the words of Christ a fitting (*conveniens*) meaning is to be taught." Do. p. 541. This then is the genesis of the two views: Body cannot be bread, but as there *is* body there is no bread: bread cannot be body, but as there *is* bread there is no body.

With such a principle, only a third possibility remains: it is to apply it rigidly and consistently to every part of the Institution, to take away the bread with the Romanist, and the body with the Rationalist, and then we have the Lord's Supper of the Quaker and other mystics, with neither supernatural reality nor outward element—all idea, all spirit. The extravagance of the Romish materializing of the presence of Christ's body, and of the rationalistic exaggeration, which leaves only natural matter, run into the nihilism of the mystic. You cannot annihilate either element in the Lord's Supper without annihilating both.

In the doctrine of Transubstantiation, nevertheless, as in almost all of her corruptions, the Church of Rome has not so much absolutely removed the foundation, as hidden it by the wood, hay, and stubble of human device. Truth can some-

times be reached by running the corruptions of it back to the trunk on which they were grafted. Such an error as that of Transubstantiation could never have been grafted on an original faith like that of Zwingli in regard to the Lord's Supper. The tendency of the Zwinglian view, if it be corrupted, is to laxer, not to higher, views of the sacramental mystery. Such an error as the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary never could have been grafted on a faith originally Socinian. It is a corruption which presupposes as a truth, to be corrupted in its inference, the divinity and sinlessness of our Lord Jesus Christ; and just as the comparatively modern corruption of the worship of the Virgin is a proof that faith in the Godhead of Jesus Christ was part of the primitive faith, so does the comparatively modern corruption of Transubstantiation prove that faith in the objective supernatural presence of the body and blood of our Lord was part of the primitive faith. A rotten apple always presupposes a sound apple. However corrupt a fig may be, we know that it grew on a fig-tree, and not on a thistle.

4. *The Sacramental Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ—Zwinglian and Calvinistic Views—Concessions of Un-Lutheran Writers.*

Our fourth proposition in the analytic exhibition of the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession is:

That the true body and blood of Christ, truly present in the Lord's Supper, under the species of bread and wine, *are communicated*.\*

We have virtually proved this proposition in proving the three which preceded it. Nevertheless, in the affluence of Scripture evidence sustaining the doctrine of our Church, we can well afford to give this thesis a distinct vindication. We affirm, then, that this fourth proposition is explicitly taught in 1 Cor. x. 16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not

---

\* German, *ausgetheilt*; Lat., *distribuantur*. In the Apology; Lat., *exhibeantur*; German, *dargereicht*.

the communion [*κοινωνία*] of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion [*κοινωνία*] of the body of Christ?" This passage, in its express terms and in its connection, is what Luther calls it—a thunderbolt upon the heads of errorists in regard to the Lord's Supper. The figment of Transubstantiation is overthrown by it, for it expressly mentions bread, and that which communicates cannot be identical with that which is communicated by it. St. Paul expressly mentions the two elements; the bread, which is the earthly; the body of our Lord, which is the heavenly; the sacramental union and the impartation of the heavenly in, with, and under the earthly. The passage equally overthrows all the Rationalistic corruptions of the doctrine. Zwingle says: The bread is the *sign* of the body; Paul says: The bread is the *communion* of the body; Zwingle says: The wine is the *sign* of the blood; Paul says: The cup is the *communion* of the blood. On Zwingle's theory, any and all bread is as such the sign of Christ's body; on Paul's theory, it is the bread which *we break*, that is, the sacramental bread only, which is the communion of Christ's body; on Zwingle's theory, any wine and all wine is, as such, the sign of Christ's blood; on Paul's theory, only the cup of blessing, which *we bless*, in the Supper, is the communion of Christ's blood; on Zwingle's theory the relation of the bread and body is that of symbol and of reality; on Paul's theory, it is the relation of communicating medium and of the thing communicated; on Zwingle's theory, we receive the cup to be reminded of the blood; on Paul's theory, we receive the cup to receive the blood. On Zwingle's theory, the argument of the Apostle is sophistical and pointless in the last degree, for as all bread is equally an emblem of Christ's body as food for the soul, and all wine equally an emblem of Christ's blood as the refreshing of the soul, any and every eating of bread, and any and every drinking of wine, would be the communion of His body and blood; therefore, to eat bread and to drink wine at the table of Demons, would be, on Zwingle's theory of symbol, to have communion with Christ's body and blood; for bread is a symbol of nourishment, wine a symbol of re-

freshing, without reference to the time or place of receiving them; their whole character as symbols depends on what bread is, as bread—on what wine is, as wine; and the Corinthian could make the table of Demons a Lord's Supper by the simple mental act of thinking of the bread and wine as symbols of Christ's body and blood. A vine, as a symbol of Christ, is equally a symbol, whether it grows on the land of devil-worshippers or of Christians; bread, as a symbol of Christ's body, is equally a symbol, whether baked by Atheist, Jew, or Pagan; whether eaten at the table of Demons or at the table of the Lord. The logic of Zwingle's position is, then, exactly the opposite of that of the Apostle, and would make his conclusion in the last degree absurd.

Equally do the words overthrow the Calvinistic theory. Calvin's theory is, that the Holy Spirit communicates the body of Christ; Paul's is, that the bread communicates it; he mentions but two elements, bread and body. Calvin says, the Holy Spirit communicates the blood of Christ; Paul says, that the cup communicates it, two elements only again, cup and blood, not three: cup, Holy Spirit, and blood. Calvin makes faith the communicating medium; Paul says, the bread we break, the cup we bless, is the communicating medium. Calvin makes the communion of the body and blood of Christ, one which is confined to worthy recipients, true believers, while to all others there is but the communication of bread and wine; Paul is speaking of what the communion also is to some who "eat and drink unworthily, "not discerning the Lord's body," "eating and drinking damnation to themselves," "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," and yet he affirms that to them the bread communicates the body, the cup, the blood of Christ. Calvin's communion is one which can take place anywhere and always, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit is always present, and faith can always be exercised; Paul's is expressly limited to that with which the bread and cup are connected. Calvin's is a communion of the virtue and efficacy of the body and blood of Christ; Paul's is a communion of the body and blood themselves. Calvin's is the communion of an absent



body and blood; Paul's the communion of a present body and blood, so present that bread, broken and given, imparts the one, and the cup, blessed and taken, imparts the other. Calvin talks of a faith by which we spiritually eat an absent body, Paul of elements by which we sacramentally eat a present body.

As by Zwingle's theory, so by Calvin's also, the argument of the Apostle here is emptied of all force. For the argument of the Apostle is addressed to those who eat and drink unworthily, that is to those who had not faith. The very necessity of the argument arises from the presupposition of a want of true faith in the Lord, on the part of those to whom it was addressed. But on the Calvinistic theory the communion of the body and blood of Christ and participation in them, are confined to those who have faith. These Corinthians therefore, had St. Paul taught them a theory like that of Calvin, might have replied: 'O, no! as we are without true faith, and are receiving unworthily, we receive nothing but bread and wine, but as bread and wine, were not the sacrifices, which Christ offered to God, we do not come into fellowship with God's altar by partaking of *them*—therefore we are not guilty of what you charge on us, to wit, the inconsistency of eating, and drinking at the same time, of the sacrifices offered on God's altar, and of the sacrifices offered on the altar of Demons.' The Calvinistic theory makes the argument of the Apostle an absurdity.

Two parallels in the connection help to bring out very vividly the Apostle's idea. One is the parallel with Israel: v. 18. "Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which *eat of the sacrifices* partakers of the altar?" The point seems to be most clearly this: that the communion of the body of Christ in the Supper is as real as the eating of the animal sacrifices in the Jewish Church. Christ's body is the true sacrifice which takes once for all the place of the Jewish sacrifices, and the sacramental communion, in which that body is the sustenance, in ever renewing application of the one only sacrifice, takes the place of the Jewish eating of the sacrifice. The other parallel is with the eating the sacrifices and drinking of the cup



offered to idols, v. 21. The communion of the body and blood of Christ is represented as no less real in its nature and positive in its results than the other communication of the sacrificial flesh and cup.

The parallel may be offered thus to the eye, as regards the Jews and the Christians.

Israel after the flesh, or  
the Jews,  
have the typical sacrifice,  
of the body,  
and blood,  
of animals,  
on the typical altar,  
and eat  
of the typical sacrifice  
of animal body and blood  
at the Jewish Festival,  
the sacrificial supper,  
and thus partake  
of the typical altar.

Israel after the spirit, or  
Christians,  
have the real sacrifice,  
of the body,  
and blood,  
of Christ,  
on the true altar,  
and eat  
of the true sacrifice  
of Christ's body and blood  
at the Christian festival,  
the Lord's Supper,  
and thus partake  
of the true altar.

Here the parallel is between type and truth—in the parallel between Pagans and Christians it is between falsehood and truth.

In a word the whole argument involves a parallel between three things:

I. The Sacrificial meal of the Jews.

II. The Sacrificial meal of the Pagans.

III. The Sacrificial meal of the Christians, or Lord's Supper.

The common idea that underlies the triple parallel is, that in each of these meals there is a true communion, communication, or impartation of the thing sacrificed, whereby the receiver is brought into the fellowship of the Altar, on which it was sacrificed, and thus into fellowship with the being to whom it was sacrificed—the Pagan with the Demons, the Jew with God as hidden in type, the Christian with God unveiled, and incarnate in Christ.

The parallel in the thought in Hebr. xiii. 10-12 is also well worthy of notice: "We have an *altar*, whereof they have no right to *eat*, which serve the tabernacle. For the *bodies* of those beasts, whose *blood* is brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest for sin, are burnt without the camp. Wherefore, Jesus, also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate." Here is altar over against altar, body over against body, blood over against blood, sacrifice over against sacrifice, eating over against eating. We have the true altar over against the typifying altar, the true body, blood, and sacrifice of Christ over against the typifying body, blood and sacrifice of beasts, the true sacramental and communicating eating over against the typifying eating, which foreshadowed, but could not consummate a communion.

If language can express a thought unmistakably, the words of Paul (1 Cor. x.) imply, that, in the Lord's Supper, there is a supernatural reality, a relation between the bread and the body of Christ, which makes the one the medium of the reception of the other; that our atoning sacrifice, after a different manner, but a manner not less real than that of the sacrifice of Jew and Pagan, is communicated to us in the Holy Supper, as their sacrifices were given in their feasts. The Lord's Supper indeed may be regarded as a summing up of the whole fundamental idea of Old Testament sacrifice, a covenant consummated by sacrifice, and entered into by the covenanting parties, receiving, each after the mode appropriate to him, that which is sacrificed; the Almighty Father, accepting His Son, as the Victim offered for the sins of the whole world, and the world accepting in the Holy Supper the precious body and blood which apply in perpetual renewal through all generations, the merits of the oblation made, once for all, upon the Cross.

The interpretation of these passages implied by our Church in her Confession is sustained by the universal usage of the Church Catholic, by the judgment of the greatest of the fathers. Greek and Latin, by the opinion of the most eminent dogmaticians and expositors, ancient and modern, and even by the concessions of interpreters who reject the Lutheran faith.

1. The whole Church from the earliest period has called, and now calls the Lord's Supper, the Communion. That Supper alone has this name. But what solution of the sole application of this name can be given except that in it the body and blood of Christ are communicated and received as they are no where else. The universal Christian consciousness, and language attest the supernatural reality of the presence of the body and blood of Christ.

2. The drift of *patristic* interpretation may be gathered from the extracts which follow :

IGNATIUS: (Ordnained by the Apostle Peter, ab. A. D. 43, d. 107). "The Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ. There is one cup for the uniting (*ἑνωσιν*) of His blood."

JUSTIN MARTYR: (d. 165). "The food over which the Eucharistic prayer has been made is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus."

IRENÆUS: (d. 202). "When the mingled cup, and the broken bread receive the words of God, it becomes the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ."

AMBROSE. (d. 307). "We receiving of one bread and of one cup, are receivers and partakers of the body of the Lord."

CHRYSOSTOM: (d. 407). "Very persuasively and fearfully He speaks: For what He says is this, That very thing which is in this cup is that which flowed from His side, and of that we are partakers. Not only hath He poured it out, but He hath imparted of it to us all. What is more fearful than this. Yet, what more kindly affectioned? The bread which we break is it not the communion, (*κοινωνία*) of the body of Christ? Why does He not say Participation, (*μετοχή*)? Because He wished to signify something more (than participation,) and to indicate the greatness of the joining together." THEOPHYLACT\* and JOHN, of Damascus, adopt and repeat these words of Chrysostom.

\* THEOPHYLACT: (1078.) "Non dixit participatio, sed communicatio ut aliquid excellentius indicet puta summam unionem. Quid autem dicit hujusmodi est, hoc quod in calice est, illud est quod effluxit de latere Christi, et ex eo accipientes communicamus, id est unimur Christo."

JEROME: (d. 420). "Is it not the Communion of the blood of Christ? As the Saviour Himself saith: He who eateth my flesh and drinketh My blood, abideth in Me, and I in him."

THEODORET: (d. 456). "Enjoying the sacred mysteries, are we not partakers with Him, the Master?"

JOHN OF DAMASCUS: (d. 750). "As the body is united with the Logos, so also we are united with Him by this bread." "The Lord's Supper is called, and is in very deed a communion, (*κοινωνία*) because through it we commune (*κοινωνεῖν*) with Christ and become partakers of His flesh." *Orthod. Fidei*, lib. IV. XIV.

3. The Reformers of the Non-Lutheran tendency make important concessions.

CALVIN: "The thing itself is also present, nor does the soul less receive (*percipiat*) the communion of the blood, than we drink the wine with the mouth." "The wine is no longer a common drink, but dedicated to the spiritual nourishment of the soul, inasmuch as it is a token (*tessera*) of the blood of Christ."

PETER MARTYR: "Ye are of the body of Christ, His members, participants (*participes*) of His body and blood." "Christians have association and conjunction with one another, which hath its seat in this (*in eo sita est*), that they are participants of the body and blood of Christ."

But no witness to the cogency of the passage is perhaps so striking as that of ZUINGLE, who in the effort to explain away a text so fatal to his theory, falls upon this violent and extraordinary interpretation, "What, I ask, is the cup of blessing which we bless, EXCEPT OUR OWN SELVES (*quam nos ipsi*)? HE GIVES THE NAME OF THE BLOOD OF CHRIST TO THOSE WHO TRUST IN HIS BLOOD. In this passage the communion of the blood of Christ are those who exult, that they have obtained liberty in Christ's blood. ALL WE who are participants of one bread and one cup, ARE THE BLOOD OF CHRIST AND THE BODY OF CHRIST. We have treated this point somewhat more verbosely, but we have done it because this passage, either NOT UNDERSTOOD, OR BADLY INTERPRETED, even by many learned men, has given to

the simple, occasion of believing, that in the bread the body of Christ is eaten, and in the wine His blood is drunk." Who does not feel that Zuingli would have weakened his cause less by saying honestly, "I cannot harmonize this text with my view," than he has by an interpretation so forced as to look like evidence of purpose to make in any way God's words, square with a certain assumption?

4. A few distinguished names among English and American writers may be quoted. On these words, POOL, the great master among the old Puritan commentators, says: "The cup which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? that is, it is an action whereby and wherein Christ communicates Himself and His grace to us." "The bread is the communion of the body of Christ; an action wherein Christians have a fellowship and communion with Christ." It will be noticed that, in the face of the text, POOL substitutes "Christ" for "body of Christ," and again for "blood of Christ." Substitute the very term of the sacred Word for his substitute, and POOL is forced to say of the Lord's Supper: "It is an action whereby and wherein Christ communicates His blood to us," "an action whereby Christians have a fellowship and communion with the body of Christ," and this is, as far as it goes, the very doctrine of our Church.

Bishop WILSON's paraphrase is: "The bread which we break, after consecration, is it not that by which we have communion with Christ, our Head?"

HUSSEY explains the "communion," "by spiritually partaking of the blood and body of Christ in the Eucharist."

The OLDER TRANSLATORS in English bring out the true sense very clearly: "Is not the cup of blessing, which we bless, partaking of the blood of Christ?" "Is not the bread which we break, partaking of the body of Christ?" Such is the rendering of the earliest and latest Tyndale, of Coverdale, of Cranmer, and of the Bishops. The first English translation, and for more than half a century the only one, which used the word "communion" was the Genevan, which was made at

Geneva by English religious fugitives who were strong Calvinists, and who here followed Beza, evidently for doctrinal reasons, as the marginal note shows. From the Genevan (1557) it went into the Authorized Version (1611), which obscures the Apostle's reasoning by rendering *koinonia*, in the sixteenth verse, communion, and *koinonos*, in the eighteenth verse, "partakers" and "fellowship."

HAMMOND translates the word *κοινωνια* "communication," and paraphrases it: "The Christian feast of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper is . . . the making us partakers of the body and blood of Christ," and refers to his note on Acts ii. 42, in which he says: "The word *koinonia* is to be rendered, not *communion*, but *communication*, by that, meaning distribution . . . or participation, by which any are made partakers of some gift. In this notion is the word generally used in Scripture for . . . some kind of distributing or dispensing to others. . . . So in 1 Cor. x. 16, the participating of the body and blood of Christ."

Bishop HALL (d. 1656): "That sacred cup . . . is it not that wherein we have a joint communion with Christ, in partaking of His blood? The bread . . . is it not that wherein we . . . have communion with Christ, in a joint receiving of His body?"

Archbishop SHARP: "St. Paul here plainly teaches us that these sacred signs make those who use them to have communion with Christ crucified."

The WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY'S Annotations represent the communion as "a sign or pledge of the spiritual communion which we have together, who by faith *participate* in the body and blood of Christ."

MATTHEW HENRY says: "He lays down his argument from the Lord's Supper, *a feast on the sacrificed body and blood of our Lord.*"

MACKNIGHT translates: "Is it (the cup of blessing) not the joint participation of the blood of Christ? Is it (the loaf which we break) not the joint participation of the body of Christ?"

ADAM CLARKE gives this as the force of the words: "We who partake of this sacred cup, in commemoration of the

death of Christ, are *made partakers of His body and blood*, and thus have fellowship with Him."

CONYBEARE and HOWSON thus paraphrase the words: "When we drink the cup of blessing which we bless, are we not all partakers in the blood of Christ? When we break the bread, are we not all partakers in the body of Christ?" and say in the note: "Literally, the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a common participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a common participation in the body of Christ?"

PARKHURST, in his Greek Lexicon, gives as the proper definition of *koinonia* in this passage, "a partaking, participation."

DR. ROBINSON defines the word, "a partaking, sharing," and cites 1 Cor. x. 16 as an illustration of the meaning "participation."

ALFORD: "*Koinonia*, the participation (*i. e.* that whereby the act of participation takes place) of the blood of Christ. The strong literal sense must here be held fast, as constituting the very kernel of the Apostle's argument. . . . If we are to render this '*estin*,' *represents* or *symbolizes*, THE ARGUMENT IS MADE VOID."

DR. JOHN W. NEVIN, in his *Mystical Presence*, speaking of the language in this place, says: "This much it does most certainly imply, that the communion is something *more than figurative or moral*. It is the communion of Christ's *body and blood*, a real participation in His true human life, as the one only and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world."

GILL, the great Baptist Rabbinist, on the words: "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" says: "It is; for not only believers by this act have communion with His mystical body, the Church, *but with His natural body*, which was broken for them; they in a spiritual sense, and by faith, eat His flesh, as well as drink His blood, and partake of Him."

DR. SCHMUCKER, in his Catechism says, that "worthy communicants, *in this ordinance*, by faith spiritually feed on the



body and blood of the Redeemer, thus holding communion or fellowship with Him," and cites 1 Cor. x. 16 to prove it.

DR. HODGE, of Princeton, says: "It is here assumed, that partaking of the Lord's Supper brings us into communion with Christ. . . The Apostle's argument is founded on the assumption, that a participation of the cup is a participation of the blood of Christ; and that a participation of the bread is a participation of the body of Christ. Is it not the communion of the blood of Christ; that is, is it not the *means of participating* in the blood of Christ? He who partakes of the cup partakes of Christ's blood. . . . By partaking of the bread, we partake of the body of Christ."

5. We will cite as representative of GERMAN INTERPRETATION, four names: the first representing the Ancient Lutheran Orthodoxy; the second the intermediate Lutheran Theology of the 18th Century; the third the Unionistic Theology of our own era; and the fourth, a witness to the irresistible character of the text, which compels a rationalistic commentator to acknowledge its true force.

CALOVIVS: "The earthly thing, to wit the bread, is taken in an earthly manner: the heavenly thing, to wit the body of Christ, is taken and eaten in a manner fitting it, that is a heavenly or mystical manner. As that union is *sacramental* and is in mystery, and hence called *mystical*, the manner of eating which depends upon it, is as regards the body of Christ '*plainly, mystical, sacramental, and incomprehensible* to human reason,' as *Hunnius* correctly observes."

S. J. BAUMGARTEN: "The communion of the cup with the blood of Christ, can here be taken in a twofold mode: 1). The cup stands in communion with the blood of Christ—is a means of offering and imparting it. 2). The cup is a means of uniting the participants with the blood of Christ—a means whereby they are made participants of it. The second presupposes the first."

OLSHAUSEN: "Were there in the Supper no communion with Christ but in spirit, the words would be "Communion of Christ," not "communion of the body," "communion of the blood of Christ." As of course the language refers to Christ in His state of exaltation, it is of His glorified flesh and blood

it speaks: "these come in the Supper into attingence with the participant, and thus mediate the communion."

RUECKERT is the last name we shall cite, and as witness on the point here involved, no name could carry more force with it. Rueckert is one of the greatest scholars of the age, a historico-critical rationalist, at the furthest extreme from the Lutheran position, making it his peculiar boast that, rising above all Confessions and parties, he accepts the results of scientific exegesis. He professes to make it his law, "that you are to lend nothing that is yours to your author, and omit nothing that is his—you are not to ask what he ought to say, nor be afraid of what he does say." Rueckert, in his work on the Lord's Supper,\* after a very thorough investigation of the sense of 1 Cor. x., says: "Paul . . . sees in the Supper, Christ's body and blood . . . as supersensuous and heavenly, which He gives as food and drink at His table to believers, and indeed without any exception, and without distinction between worthy and unworthy participants." He then shows that there is no possibility of evading the acceptance of the doctrine except by rejecting the authority of Paul, and by appealing to "the decision of rational thinking." Rationalism itself, in the person of one of its greatest representatives, being judge, it has no foothold in the text. Rueckert, moreover, confesses that the earliest faith of the Church agrees with this result of the latest scientific exegesis: "That in the Supper the body and blood of Christ are given and received, *was the universal faith*, from the beginning. . . . This faith abode in the aftertime; the Christian *people* (Gemeinde) never had any other, and in the Ancient Church it had not a solitary person to oppose it; the extremest heretics themselves never did it."

##### 5. *The Communion of the Unworthy.*†

The Fifth Proposition in the analytical view of the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession is:

That the true body and blood of Christ, truly present and

\* 1856. P. 241, 297.

† See Seb. Schmidt: *De princip. a. fundam. præs. Corpor. et Sanguin. Christi* Argentor, 1699. Chap. xi.

truly communicated under the species of bread and wine, are received by all communicants.\*

"He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (*or*, judgment) to himself, not discerning, (*διακρίνων*) the Lord's body." (because he hath not distinguished the body,. . . Syr. Ether. Eateth and drinketh condemnation on himself, by not discerning. . . Syr. Murdock): "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty, *ἐνοχος* of the body and blood of the Lord," (is guilty of the blood of the Lord and of His body). Syr. Etheridge. 1 Cor. xi. 27-29.

From the four propositions already established it is a necessary inference, and in the cogent texts just quoted it is expressly taught, that, while none but those who receive in faith, receive savingly, all who come to the Supper receive *sacramentally*, the body and blood of Christ. As those to whom the gospel is a savor of death unto death, receive in common with those to whom it is a savor of life unto life, one and the same thing outwardly, to wit: the gospel; so do those who abuse, to their own condemnation, the Lord's Supper, and those who rightly use it to their soul's welfare, receive one and the same thing sacramentally. It is the very essence of the sin of the rejection of the gospel, that, receiving it outwardly, with the attendant energy of the Holy Spirit in, with, and under it, the rejector has not received it inwardly, and thus makes it not merely practically void, but pernicious to his soul. So is it the very essence of the sin of unworthy treatment of the Lord's Supper, that, receiving it in its sacred and divine element, as well as in its outward one, the communicant makes no inward appropriation of the benefit there offered, but turns, by his unbelief, the food of his soul to its poison. In the passages quoted immediately after the Thesis, men whose unworthiness is such, that their condemnation is sealed by their eating, are represented as guilty of the body and blood of Christ; that

---

\* German: da . . . genommen wird. Latin: vescentibus. Apology: his qui sacramentum accipiunt.

is the object of their abuse is specifically declared to be, not bread and wine, either in themselves or as symbols, but the body and blood of Christ. That which they are treating with contumely is said to be the body of the Lord, and their crime is, that they do not discern it, "not discerning the body of the Lord." But unbelief would be its own safeguard, if it were the communicant's faith, and not the will and institution of Christ, which was the ground of the presence. The unbeliever could say: 'As I have no faith, there is no body of Christ to discern; there is no body and blood of which I can be guilty.' Of such men, moreover, the Apostle, in the previous chapter, declared, that the broken bread and the cup of blessing are to them also the communion of the body and blood of Christ.

Let any man weigh solemnly the import of the thought: He that eateth unworthily of this bread is guilty of the body of the Lord; he that drinketh unworthily of this cup is guilty of the blood of the Lord; and then let him ask himself, before the Searcher of hearts, whether he dare resolve the Lord's Supper into a mere eating of a symbol of Christ's body, the drinking of a symbol of Christ's blood? Let it be remembered, that, in the case of the Corinthians, deeply as they had sinned, there was no designed dishonor of the sacramental elements, still less of Christ, whom they set forth, there was no hatred to Christ, no positive infidelity, and yet an unworthy drinking of the sacramental cup made them "*guilty of the blood of Christ.*" The Apostle expressly tells us, too, whereon the fearfulness of their guilt and the terribleness of their penalty turned: "They ate and drank damnation to themselves, *not discerning* (making no difference of) *the Lord's body.*" But on all the rationalistic interpretations there is no body of the Lord there to discern.

To "discern" (*diakrinein*) elsewhere translated to "make or put differences between," involves a correct mental and moral judgment; it means to distinguish between two things which there is a liability of confounding, to mark the distinction between one thing and another. "Can I *discern* between good and evil?" "That I may discern between good and bad." "Cause them to discern between clean and unclean," that is

to mark and make the distinction, in mind, feeling, and act. To "discern the body of the Lord," is therefore to discriminate between it, and something which is, or might be confounded with it, to mark its difference from some other thing, to believe, feel, and act in the conviction, that it is not that other thing, but is the body of the Lord. The point is, That which you receive in the Lord's Supper is not mere bread and wine, as your conduct would imply that it is, but is also the body and blood of Christ, therefore, your guilt (taking its root in a failure to discern this body and blood) is not that of the abuse of bread and wine, but of the indignity offered to His body and blood which they communicate; therefore your punishment is not simply that of men guilty of gluttony and drunkenness, but that of men guilty of a wrong done to the body and blood of Christ; therefore sickness and death have been sent to warn you of your awful crime, and if these warnings be not heeded, your final doom will be to perish with the world (v. 32).

The *sacramental* communion was ordained of Christ as the means of the *spiritual* communion. In its divine essence, that is, in its sacramental character the Lord's Supper is unchangeable, but its *effects* and *blessings* are conditioned upon the faith of the recipient. The same sunlight falls upon the eye of the blind and of the seeing alike; both eyes alike *receive* it, but the eye of the seeing alone *perceives* it; it is communicated to both, it is, "discerned" by but the one. But the analogy fails at an important point: In spirituals the lack of the perception with the reception is voluntary, and, therefore, while the blind eye suffers privation only, the blind soul comes under condemnation. It is the blind man's *misfortune* that he does not see, it is the unbelieving man's *guilt* that he does not *discern*. The diseased and the sound eat of the same natural bread; but to one it brings strength, to another it is without effect and to yet another it brings nausea and agony. The difference of result is owing to the difference of condition in the recipient. The Holy Spirit breathes forever on and in the word, and is, with it, received by all who hear the word, quickening the yielding heart, and hardening the heart which resists Him.

Jesus said to every one of the disciples present, probably to Judas, who betrayed, certainly to Peter, who soon after denied Him: "Take, eat, This is My body given for you;" and the ministers of Christ for eighteen centuries have said to every communicant, believing or unbelieving, "Take, eat, This is the body of Christ given for you," and what Christ said, and they say, is unchangingly true. So far there is no distinction made by the character of the recipient, for as much as this depended upon Christ's will, and is therefore unchanging. "The gifts of God are without repentance," that is, there is no vacillation, repentance, or fluctuation of mind in God. But when to these absolute words is added: "*Do* this in remembrance of me," there comes, in something dependent upon man's will, and which may, therefore, fluctuate. As it is true, even of the man that perishes, that Christ's body was broken and His blood shed for him, "for our Lord Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for *every man*;" as it is true that every man in the Resurrection shall be called forth from the grave, for "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive," though some shall rise to glory, and others to shame; so is it true that every man, however unworthy, sacramentally partakes of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, though it be to his own condemnation. As the unbelieving, under the Old Dispensation, were equally with the believing outwardly sprinkled with the blood of the covenant, though they received not, for lack of faith, its blessings; as those who are unbelieving and baptized receive the baptism itself in its sacramental entirety, though they do not appropriate its blessings, so do the communicants in the Holy Supper confirm the testimony, that, although unbelief shuts us out from the blessings of the promises and ordinances, we cannot thereby make them of none effect. Our faith does not make and our unbelief cannot unmake them. The same objective reality is in every case presented, and in every case it is one and the same thing, whose benefits faith appropriates, and unbelief rejects.

That Judas was at the Supper of the Lord seems highly probable. Matthew and Mark, after telling us that our Lord



"sat down with the *twelve*," describe the Institution of the Supper without giving a hint of the departure of Judas. Luke, who proposed to write "in order," and who is generally regarded as most precise in his chronology, in direct connection with the words of the Supper, immediately *after* them, tells us our Lord said: "But, behold! the hand of him that betrayeth Me is with Me on the table." (Luke xxii. 21.) The force of the word "immediately," in John xiii. 30, is not such as to exclude the possibility of what Luke seems so distinctly to assert, and what the two other synoptical evangelists more than imply, to wit, that Judas was present at the Lord's Supper, and such is the judgment of the oldest and best commentators, and, among them, of Calvin himself, and of others, who, in common with him, had a doctrinal interest in denying the presence of Judas. Moreover, as John does not give an account of the Institution of the Supper, we may naturally settle the chronological and other questions connected with it from the synoptists. But if our Lord could say to Judas also, "Take, eat, This is My body," then the sacramental character of the Supper cannot depend upon the worthiness or faith of the receiver.

In all divine provisions for the salvation of man, we must discriminate between the *essence*, which is of God, and is, like Him, unchanging, and the *use* of them, which is by man, and is conditioned on his faith. The divine reality is neither affected by the character of the giver nor of the receiver, as a gold coin does not cease to be gold, though the giver hands it away carelessly as a piece of brass, and the receiver takes it as brass and casts it into the mire. Faith is not a Philosopher's Stone; it cannot convert lead into gold; it can only grasp what is. Nor can unbelief by a reverse process convert gold into lead; it can only reject what is. "Unto *us* was the *gospel* preached, as well as unto *them*; but the word preached did not *profit* them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." The *gospel*, the word, the sacrament, remain one and the same, but the *profit* connected with them depends upon the faith of those that receive them.



God is not far from any one of us, yet none but the believing realize the benefits of His presence. The multitude thronged and pressed upon Jesus ; His presence was equally real in its *essence* to all, but the saving efficacy of it went forth in virtue only to the woman who touched His clothes in faith. (Mark v. 30.) So Christ is present in the sacramental drapery, alike to all communicants, but the touch of faith is needed to participate in the virtue of His healing. The touch of those who crucified our Lord was no less real than that of the woman whose touch brought healing ; but their touch, like the unworthy eating and drinking, made them "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." And as no indignity which they could offer to the raiment of our Lord could make them guilty of His body and blood, so may we reason, that no indignity offered to bread and wine, even if they were the sacramental medium of the body and blood of Christ, and still less if they were but bread and wine, could make those who offered it guilty of the body and blood of Christ. The truth is, that the terms in which the guilt of the unworthy communicants is characterized, and the fearful penalties with which it was visited, to wit, temporal judgments, even unto death, and eternal condemnation with the world, if the sin was not repented of, make it inconceivable that the objective element in the Lord's Supper is bread and wine merely ; but if the body and blood be there objectively, then must they be received sacramentally by all communicants. If it be said Christ cannot be substantially present to unworthy communicants according to His human nature, otherwise they must derive benefit from it, it might be correctly replied, neither can He be substantially present with them according to His divine nature, otherwise they must derive benefit from that ; but the latter is conceded by the objector, therefore he must concede that his argument is of no weight against the possibility of the former. Christ is a Saviour, but He is also a judge.

But if it be granted that the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper is one which is fixed, absolute, and unchanging, then must it be substantial, and not imaginary ; not

a thing of our minds, but of His wonderful person, not ideal, but true; faith does not make it, but finds it, unto life; unbelief does not unmake it, but, to its own condemnation, fails to discern it. The sacramental presence is fathomless, like the Incarnation; like it, also, it is in the sphere of supernatural reality, to which the natural is as the shadow. The presence of the communicant at the Supper belongs to a lower sphere of actuality than the presence of the undivided Christ in it; and the outward taking and eating is the divinely appointed means whereby the ineffable mystery of the communion of Christ's body and blood is consummated, a communion heavenly and spiritual in its manner over against all that is earthly and fleshly; but in its essence more true than all earthly truth, more real than all earthly reality, more substantial than all earthly substance. The body and blood of Christ are more truly present in the Supper than are the bread and wine, because their sphere of presence is divine; the bread and wine are but the gifts of the hand of God, the body and blood of Christ are inseparable constituents of God's incarnate person.

The Non-Lutheran interpreters have made concessions of great importance in their interpretation of these texts. GUALTHER, one of the greatest of the Zurich divines (d. 1586) says: "Shall be held guilty of the same crime with Judas who betrayed Christ, with the Jews and soldiers who scourged Him, spit upon Him, wounded, crucified Him, and shed His blood."

PAREUS: Heidelberg (d. 1622): "Judas betrayed, the Jews condemned, the soldiers pierced Christ's body and shed His blood upon the Cross. They who abuse the sacrament are absolutely partakers in their crime, (*sceleri prorsus communicant*)."

SEBASTIAN MEYER, of Berne: "They commit murder (*cædem committere*) and shed the Redeemer's blood," "incur the dreadful crime of parricide."

One more proposition remains to be touched, but it is negative in its character, and in this article we have proposed to confine ourselves to the positive and thetical. Here, therefore, we reach the end of our exhibition of the positive propositions

in which our great Confession sets forth the faith of our Church. We have the five simple propositions which are yielded by the analysis of the Tenth Article. We have viewed them purely as Scriptural questions. We have treated them very much as independent propositions, establishing each on special evidence of its own. But, while the argument for the faith of our Church is so strong on each head as well as on the whole as to bear even this severe process, it should not be forgotten that none of these are, in fact, isolated. They cling together with all the internal coherence of divine truth. The truth of any one of them implies the truth of all of them. If we have failed in establishing four separately, yet have succeeded in establishing one, then have we in establishing that established the five.

The sense of the words of the Institution which our Church confesses, which is derived from the words themselves, is sustained by every Scripture allusion to them. Not only is there not the faintest hint anywhere that they are figurative, but every fresh allusion to them gives new evidence that they are to be taken as they sound. If the *offering* of the ancient sacrifices pointed to a true offering of Christ, the eating of the sacrifices necessarily points to a true, though supernatural, communion of the body and blood which He offered. If the slaying of the Paschal Lamb pointed to the slaying of Christ's body, the sacramental reception of the body of the Lamb of God must be a part of the New Testament Passover; the Lord's Supper cannot substitute an unreality for a reality, but must substitute a higher reality for a lower one. If Moses meant what he said when he declared, as he sprinkled the book and the people: "This is the blood of the Testament which God hath enjoined unto you," (Heb. ix. 20,) then must our Lord be accepted at His word, when, with the covenanting terms of the Old Testament, the Testament of Moses, so clearly in his eye, and meaning to mark the New Testament antithesis, He says: "This is *My* blood, of the New Testament." Every Scripture declaration in regard to the Supper of the Lord points, with an unvarying tendency, to the great result which is treasured in the faith of our Church.

When we ask, What is it which Christ tells us to, Take, eat? he replies, This is My body, not This is a sign of My body. When we ask, What does the bread communicate? St. Paul replies, The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? not the communion of the sign of His body. When we ask, What is he guilty of who eats and drinks unworthily? the answer is, He is guilty of the body and blood of Christ, not of the sign of the body or sign of the blood. When we ask, How did the unworthy communicant come to incur this guilt? what did he fail to discern? the reply is, Not discerning the Lord's body, not that he failed to discern the sign or symbol of Christ's body. We cannot tear from its place the sacramental doctrine of our Church, without tearing up the whole Evangelical system. The principles of interpretation which relieve us of the Eucharistic mystery take from us the mystery of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement. We cannot remove Christ from the Supper and consistently leave Him anywhere else, and we can take no part of Christ from the Supper without taking away the whole. The very foundations of our faith give way under the processes which empty the Lord's Supper of its divine glory. The Sacramental Presence is the necessary sequel, the crowning glory of the Incarnation and Atonement; and the illumination of the Holy Spirit in the word which enables the eye of Faith to see God in the body, and redemption in the blood enables it to see the body in the bread, and the blood in the cup, not after the manner of the first man, who is of the earth, earthy, but after the manner of the second Man, who is the Lord from heaven.

### III.—*Summary View of the Lutheran Doctrine of the Sacramental Presence of Christ, on three Points.*

#### 1. *Modes of Presence.*

The Lutheran Church believes on the sure warrant of God's word, that the body of our Lord Jesus remains a true human body, and as to its natural and determinate presence has been removed from earth, and is in the glory of the world of angels and the redeemed. She also believes that in and through the

divine nature with which it forms one person, it is present on earth in another sense, no less true than the former. She believes that the sacramental elements are divinely appointed through the power of the Saviour's own benediction, as the medium through which we participate after a spiritual, supernatural, heavenly, substantial, objective, and true manner, "in the communion of His body and of His blood." (1 Cor. x. 16.) Our Church never has denied that the ascension of Christ was real, literal, and local; never has denied that His body has a determinate presence in heaven; never has maintained that it has a local presence on earth. Neither does she impute to Him two bodies, one present and one absent, one natural and the other glorified, but she maintains that one body, forever a natural and true body as to its essence, but no longer in its natural or earthly condition, but glorified, is absent indeed in one mode, but present in another. As she believes that God is really one in one respect, and no less really three in another respect, so does she believe that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ is really absent in one respect, and just as really present in another. Christ has left us, and He never leaves us—He has gone from us, and He is ever present with us; He has ascended far above all heavens, but it is that He may fill all things. As His divine nature, which in its totality is in heaven, and in its fullness is in Christ bodily, is on earth while it is in heaven, as that divine nature is present with us, without extension or locality, is on earth without leaving heaven, is present in a manner true, substantial and yet incomprehensible, so does it render the body of Christ, which is one person with it, also present. That body in its determinate limitations is in heaven, and in and of itself would be there alone, but *through the divine, in consequence of the personal conjunction*, and in virtue of that conjunction, using in the whole person the attributes of the whole person in both its parts, it is rendered present. It is present without extension, for the divine through which it is present is unextended—it is present without locality, for the divine through which it is present is illocal. It is on earth, for the divine is

on earth—it is in heaven, for the divine remains in heaven, and like the divine it is present truly and substantially, yet incomprehensibly.

In other words, as our Church believes that the one essence of God has two modes of presence, one general and ordinary, by which it is present to all creatures, and the other special and extraordinary, by which it is present, so as to constitute one person, after which mode it is present to none other than to the humanity of Jesus Christ, and that both modes of presence, although unlike in their results, are equally substantial; so does she believe that this one humanity taken into personal and inseparable union with this one essence, has two modes of presence, one determinate, in which it is related to space, through its own inherent properties; the other infinite, in which it is related to space in the communion of the divine attributes, and that both modes of presence, though unlike, are equally substantial.

Is it said that to deny that Christ's sacramental presence is local is to deny it altogether; that to affirm that His determinate presence is in the realm of angels and of the glorified, is to affirm that He has no presence at all on earth? Be it said, but then, at least, let the odious libel that our Church teaches consubstantiation, or a physical presence, or a corporeal or carnal mode of presence, be forever dropped. Our Church never has denied that, in the sense and in the manner in which our Lord was once on earth, He is no longer here, but she maintains that the illocal is as real as the local, the supernatural is as true as the natural. "A local absence," as Andrew said, in his argument with Beza at Montbeillard, "does not prevent a sacramental presence"; the presence of Christ's humanity on earth, through the Deity with which it is one person, is as real as is its presence through the properties of its own essence in heaven. The soundest theologians do not hesitate to declare in propositions which seem contradictory, but are not, "God is everywhere," and "God is nowhere," everywhere in His fathomless omnipresence—nowhere locally or determinately—and as is the presence of the divine, such is the



presence it imparts to the humanity which is personally united with it. The man Christ Jesus is with us after one manner, and He is not with us, after another manner; He is with us through the plenary exercise of His divine majesty, not with us in the local or determinate restrictions of space. "There is no contradiction in attributing contrary things to the same subject, provided they be affirmed in different respects and modes."\*

## 2. *A Living Saviour.*

The current view of un-Lutheran Protestantism practically is, that all we need for our redemption is a *dead Christ*. We are to look back to Calvary to find peace in thinking of what was there done, and at the Lord's Supper we are to look back to the sacrifice once made for our sins. The current view excludes the necessity of a living Saviour in our redemption. According to it, we redeem ourselves, or the Spirit of God redeems us, by what Christ once did, and without any personal work on His part now. To the theology of a large part of the Church it would be no disturbing element if the divine nature of Christ had been separated from the human after the resurrection. Instead of a robust and mighty faith which hangs upon a living Saviour, and lives by His life, we have a religion of sentiment verging away into sentimentality, a religion which lives by its own thoughts about a Saviour of bygone times. We have had in our hands a book on the Lord's Supper by an American preacher, the frontispiece of which represents a lonely tombstone, and on it the words: "To the memory of my Saviour." Nothing could more sadly, yet vigorously, epitomize the tendency of which we speak—the graveyard tendency, which turns the great festival of redemption into a time of mourning, and coldly furnishes forth the marriage tables with the baked meats of the funeral. Now the glory of the Lutheran system in all its parts, and especially in its doctrine of the Lord's Supper is, that it accepts in all its fullness the Apostle's argument: "If, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to

\* Chemnitz, *De duab. Naturis*, 179.

God by the death of His Son, MUCH MORE, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His LIFE." Never, indeed, has the human heart been so taught as by our system in its purity to turn to the death of Christ for hope; but our Church has been led by the Holy Spirit too deeply into all the fullness of truth to make an antagonism between the death of her Saviour and His life.

If Christ must die to make our redemption, He must live to apply it. If the Lord's Supper is a sacrament of the redemption made by His death, it is also a sacrament of the same redemption applied by His life. If it tells us that His body and blood were necessary to make our redemption, it tells us also that they are still necessary to apply the redemption they then made. He made the sacrifice once for all—he applies it constantly. We live by Him, we must hang on Him—the vine does not send up one gush of its noble sap and then remain inert. It receives the totality of life, once for all, but the sap which sustains it must flow on—its one, unchanging and abiding life puts itself forth into the new offshoots, and by constant application of itself maintains the old branches. If the sap-life ceases, the seed-life cannot save. Cut the branch off, and the memory of the life will not keep it from withering; it must have the life itself—and this it must derive successively from the vine. It could not exist without the original life of the vine, nor can it exist without the present life of the vine, be its past what it may. Faith cannot feed on itself, as many seem to imagine it can—it must have its object. The ordinances, the Word, and the sacraments give to it that by which it lives. Faith in the nutritious power of bread does not nourish—the bread itself is necessary.

### 3. *The Propitiation and the Sacramental Presence.*

The man who feels a moral repugnance to the Scripture doctrine of the Eucharist, will find, if he analyzes his feelings thoroughly, that they take their root in a repugnance to the doctrine of the atonement by Christ's body and blood. The man who asks what use is there in a sacramental application of

them in the Lord's Supper, really asks, what use was there in a redemptory offering of them on Calvary. He may be using the terms of Scripture, but if he takes his inmost thoughts before his God, he will probably find that he has been denying the true vicarious character of the sacrifice of our Lord—that he has fallen into that conception of the sacrifice on Calvary which is essentially Socinian, for everything which brings down the oblation of the Son of God into the sphere of the natural is essentially Socinian. He will find that in his view his Lord is only a glorious martyr, or that the power of His sacrifice is only a moral power; that the cross is but a powerful sermon, and that those awful words, which in their natural import unbare, as it is nowhere else unbared, the heart of Deity in the struggle of its unspeakable love and fathomless purpose; that all these are oriental poesy—figures of speech—graces of language. The theory of the atonement, which pretends to *explain* it, is rotten at the core. The atonement, in its whole conception, belongs to a world which man cannot now enter. The blessings and adaptations of it we can comprehend in some measure. We can approach them with tender hearts full of gratitude; but the *essence* of the atonement we can understand as little as we understand the essence of God.

If Christ, through His body broken, made remission of sins, why do we ask, to what end is the doctrine, that the same body through which He made the remission is that through which He applies it? His body *as such* could make no remission of sins, but, through the Eternal Spirit, with which it was conjoined in personal unity, it made redemption—His body *as such*, may have no power to apply the redemption or to be with the redeemed, but, through the same relation by which it entered into the sphere of the supernatural to make redemption, it reveals itself now in that same sphere to apply it. All theology without exception, has had views of the atonement which were lower or higher, as its views of the Lord's Supper were low or high. Men have talked and written as if the doctrine of our Church on this point were a stupid blunder, forced upon it by the self-will and obstinacy of one man. The truth is, that this

doctrine clearly revealed in the New Testament, clearly confessed by the early Church, lies at the very heart of the Evangelical system—Christ is the centre of the system, and in the Supper is the centre of Christ's revelation of Himself. The glory and mystery of the incarnation combine there as they combine nowhere else. Communion with Christ is that by which we live, and the supper is "*the* Communion." Had Luther abandoned this vital doctrine, the Evangelical Church would have abandoned him. He did not make this doctrine, next in its immeasurable importance to that of justification by faith, with which it indissolubly coheres,—the doctrine made him. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the most vital and practical in the whole range of the profoundest Christian life—the doctrine which, beyond all others, conditions and vitalizes that life, for in it the character of faith is determined, invigorated and purified as it is nowhere else. It is not only a fundamental doctrine, but is among the most fundamental of fundamentals.

We know what we have written. We know, that to take our Saviour at His word here, to receive the teachings of the New Testament in their obvious intent, is to incur with some a reproach little less bitter than if we had taken up arms against the holiest truths of our faith. We are willing to endure it. Our fathers were willing to shed their blood for the truth, and shall we refuse to incur a little obloquy? The fact that we bear the name of a Church which stood firm when rationalizing tendencies directed themselves with all their fury against this doctrine of the Word of God, increases our responsibility. When at a later and sadder period, she yielded to subtlety what she had maintained successfully against force, and let her doctrine fall, she fell with it. When God lifted her from the dust He lifted her banner with it, and on that banner, as before, the star of a pure Eucharistic faith shone out amid the lurid clouds of her new warfare, and there it shall shine forever. Our Saviour has spoken, His Church has spoken. His testimony is explicit, as is hers. The Lutheran Church has suffered more for her adherence to this doctrine than from all other causes,

but the doctrine itself repays her for all her suffering. To her it is a very small thing that she should be judged of man's judgment, but there is one judgment she will not, she dare not hazard, the judgment of her God which they eat and drink to themselves, who will not discern the Lord's body in the Supper of the Lord.

We do not wish to be misunderstood in what we have said as to the moral repugnance to our doctrine of the supper. We distinguish between a mere intellectual difficulty, and an aversion of the affections. How New Testament-like, how Lutheran have sounded the sacramental hymns and devotional breathings of men whose theory of the Lord's Supper embodied little of its divine glory. The glow of their hearts melted the frost-work of their heads.

When they treat of sacramental communion, and of the mystical union, they give evidence, that, with their deep faith in the atonement, there is connected, in spite of the rationalizing tendency which inheres in their system, a hearty acknowledgment of the supernatural and incomprehensible character of the Lord's Supper. On the other hand the evidence is overwhelming, that, as low views of the Lord's Supper prevail, in that proportion the doctrine of the atonement exhibits a rationalizing tendency. We repeat the proposition confirmed by the whole history of the Church, that a moral repugnance to the doctrine that the body and blood of Christ are the medium through which redemption is *applied*, has its root in a moral repugnance to the doctrine that His precious body and blood are the medium through which redemption was *wrought*.

#### *IV.—The Logic of the Exegesis sustained by its History. The Testimony of the Ancient Church.\**

It is now admitted by dispassionate Scholars, who are not Lutheran in their convictions, first that the Zwinglian doctrine was unknown in the most Ancient Church. Second: that the

\* ALBERTINUS: De Eucharistie Sacram. Libri tres. Sec. ex Patribus. Dav. 1654. Folio. Still the greatest of the defences of the Calvinistic view.

BELLARMINUS: De Controv. Chr. Fidel. Paris. 1629. Folio. De Euchar. Lib. II.

doctrine of our Church in regard to the Lord's Supper, was certainly the doctrine of the fathers in the Church Catholic, from the Fourth to the Ninth Century, the second theological age, the golden, or as it is called the classic age of Christian antiquity, to wit: that "the presence of the Lord in the Eucharist" is "real, according to substance, is, with and under the species," (Marheinecke). The first age, from the Apostolic writings to the end of the third, is we believe no less decided in its unity on the same doctrine. To this conviction the studies

---

Chap. I. xxxix., Testimon. Patrum. The greatest single piece of Polemic in defence of the Church of Rome.

CLAUDE: The Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist in all ages (in answer to Arnaud) touching the belief of the Greek, Moscovite, Armenian, Jacobite, Nestorian, Coptic, Maronite, and other Eastern Churches. From the French. London, 1683, Folio. (Calvinistic).

COSIN: The History of Popish Transubstantiation to which is premised and opposed the Catholic Doctrine of . . . the Ancient Fathers. London, 1676, 8vo. (Vigorously Anti-Romish in its negations, and decidedly Lutheranizing in its affirmation.)

EUCARIST: A full view of the Doctrine and practice of the Ancient Church relating to London. 1668, 4to. (Calvinistic).

FABER, G. S.: Christ's Discourse at Capernaum, fatal to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. London, 1840. 8vo. (Copious Patristic Citation.)

GOODE, WM.: Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist: 2 vols. 8vo. London. 1856, Chap. v. The Testimony of the Fathers. (A tissue of partizan falsification. Anglican Low Church).

HOSPINIAN: Histor. Sacramentariæ Pars Prior. Exp. Coen. Domin. in primitivo et Veter. Eccles. Genev. 1681, Folio.

MARHEINECKE: Sanct. Patrum de Praes. Chr. in Coen. Dom. Senten. Triplex. Heid. 1811. 4to.

MELANCHTHON: Sententiæ veterum aliquot Scriptorum de Coena Domini. (1530). Corpus Reformat. xxlii. 727—753.

OECOLAMPADIUS: De Genuina verb. Dom. juxta vetustissimos auctores expositione Bas. 1525, 8vo. Quid de Eucharistia veter. tam Graeci, tam Latini senserunt. Dialogus. (1530) in Oecolampad., et Zwingli Epistola. Lib. iii.

PUSEY, E. B.: The doctrine of the Real Presence, as contained in the Fathers from the death of S. John the Evangelist, to the Fourth General Council vindicated. Oxford and London. 1855, 8vo.

WATERLAND: Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, as laid down in Scripture and antiquity. Oxford, 1868. 8vo. (abundant patristic citation).

The recent German works which present more or less copiously the patristic history of the doctrine are: 1, Doctrines and History: Ebrard, 1845; Kahnis, 1851; Rückert, 1856; 2, History: Döllinger, 1826; Engelhardt, (Ztschr. für histor. theol. 1842. Steiz, Jahrb. f. dtische Theol. 1864—65. Meier, 1842. Baur, Tertullian, Doctr). Tüb. Ztschr. 1839.2. See Kahnis Dogm. ii. 182. 2. Luthardt Dogm. § 74.



of the greatest of the English patristic scholars of our age has led him. His testimony given as the final result of years of close investigation has probably as great weight as human testimony is capable of having on a point of this kind. Of his vast patristic scholarship, there is no dispute. Of his great personal purity there is no question. Reared in a Church which confesses the Calvinistic view of the Supper, his education was adverse to the perception of the force of testimony sustaining the Lutheran view. If he be charged with Romanizing views, in some part of his theological thinking, it may heighten the value of his testimony here, where he maintains the Catholicity of the Lutheran view, over against the Romish corruption in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the force of the whole is heightened by his unconcealed aversion in many respects to the Lutheran Church. We mean, as the reader has already anticipated, Dr. Pusey. In his vindication of the doctrine of the Real Presence, as contained in the Fathers from the death of St. John the Evangelist, to the Fourth General Council, he demonstrates that "the belief that the elements remain after consecration in their natural substance was not supposed of old to involve any tenet of consubstantiation:" that, "Consubstantiation was not held by the Lutheran body:" which he demonstrates from the symbols of the Lutheran Church, and from Luther himself. By a most patient examination of evidence, which he cites in full, he shows upon the one hand that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is no doctrine of the Earliest Church, and that the doctrine of a true objective presence of the body and blood of Christ, and under the bread and wine, is its doctrine. No better summary of his labors, and of the conviction they strengthen in his mind can be given than that with which he closes his book:

"I have now gone through every writer who in his extant works speaks of the Holy Eucharist, from the time when St. John the Evangelist was translated to his Lord, to the dates of the Fourth General Council, A. D. 451, a period of three centuries and a half. I have suppressed nothing; I have not knowingly omitted anything; I have given every passage, as

far as in me lay, with so much of the context, as was necessary for the clear exhibition of its meaning. Of course, in writers of whom we have such large remains, as S. Augustine and S. Chrysostom, or in some with whom I am less familiar, I may have overlooked particular passages. Yet the extracts are already so large, so clear, and so certain, that any additional evidence could only have coincided with what has been already produced. Albertinus did his utmost on the Calvinistic side. His strength lies in his arguments against a physical doctrine of Transubstantiation; his weakness, in the paradox which he strangely maintains, that the Fathers did not believe a real Objective Presence. In so doing, he treats the Fathers, as others of his school have treated Holy Scripture on the other Sacrament. When his school would disparage the doctrine of Baptism, they select passages from Holy Scripture, in which it is not speaking of that Sacrament. In like way Albertinus gains the appearance of citing the Fathers on the orthodox side (as he calls it), i. e., the disbelief of the Real Presence, by quoting them when they are not speaking of the Holy Eucharist, but, e. g., of the Presence of our Lord's Human Nature in Heaven, or the absence of His Visible Presence upon earth; of the natural properties of bodies; or of spiritual, as distinct from sacramental Communion, or of the Eucharistic and outward Symbols, under which the Sacramental Presence is conveyed. Supported, as he thinks, by these, he proceeds to explain away, as he best may, the clear and distinct passages which had hitherto been alleged from the Fathers, in proof of the Doctrine of the Real Presence. Yet the very diligence of Albertinus on the one side, or of Roman Catholic controversialists on the other, obviously gives the more security, that nothing can have been overlooked, which could seem to support either side.

In the present collection, I have adduced the Fathers, not as original authorities, but as witnesses to the meaning of Holy Scripture. I have alleged them on the old, although now, on both sides, neglected rule, that what was taught "every where, at all times, by all," must have been taught to the whole

Church by the inspired Apostles themselves. The Apostles planted; they watered, they appointed others to take their ministry, to teach as they had themselves taught from God. A universal suppression of the truths which the Apostles taught and the unmarked substitution of falsehood, is a theory which contradicts human reason, no less than it does our Lord's promise to His Church. There is no room here for any alleged corruption. The earliest Fathers, S. Ignatius, S. Justin Martyr, S. Ireneus, S. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, or S. Hippolytus, state the doctrine of the Real Presence as distinctly as any later father.

And now, reader, if you have got thus far, review for a moment, from what variety of minds, as of countries, this evidence is collected. Minds the most simple and the most philosophical; the female martyrs of Persia, or what are known as the philosophic fathers; minds wholly practical, as Tertullian or S. Cyprian, S. Firmilian, S. Pacian, or S. Julius; or those boldly imaginative, as Origen; or poetic minds, as S. Ephrem or S. Isaac or S. Paulinus; fathers who most use a figurative and typical interpretation of the Old Testament, as S. Ambrose, or such as, like S. Chrysostom, from their practical character, and the exigencies of the churches in which they preached, confined themselves the most scrupulously to the letter; mystical writers, as S. Macarius, or ascetics, as Mark, the Hermit, or Apollos, or the Abbot Esaias; writers in other respects opposed to each other; the friends of Origen, as S. Didymus, or his opponents, as Theophilus of Alexandria and S. Epiphanius; or again, S. Cyril of Alexandria or Theodoret; heretics or defenders of the faith, as Eusebius and Theodorus, Hereacleotes, Arius, or S. Athanasius; Apollinarius or S. Chrysostom, who wrote against him, Nestorius or S. Cyril of Alexandria—all agree in one consentient exposition of our Lord's words, "This is My body, this is My blood." Whence this harmony, but that one spirit attuned all the various minds in the one body into one; so that the very heretics were slow herein to depart from it?

There is a difference oftentimes in the setting, so to speak, of

the one jewel truth. We may meet with that truth where *we* should not have expected it; some may even be deterred, here and there, by the mystical interpretations of Holy Scripture, amid which they find it. That mystical interpretation is no matter of faith. But a mode of interpretation which presupposes any object of belief to be alluded to, when scarce anything is mentioned which may recall it to the mind, shows at least how deeply that belief is stamped upon the soul. It is a common saying, how "Bishop Horne found our Lord Jesus Christ everywhere in the Psalms, Grotius nowhere." Certainly our Lord must have been much in Bishop Horne's heart, that everything in the Psalms spoke to his soul of Him. So much the more then, must, our Lord's gift of His body and blood have been in the hearts of the early fathers, that words which would not suggest the thought of them to others, spoke it to them.

But however different the occasions may be upon which the truth is spoken of, in whatever variety of ways it may be mentioned, the truth itself is one and the same—one uniform, simple, consentient truth; that what is consecrated upon the altars for us to receive, what, under the outward elements is there present for us to receive, is the body and blood of Christ; by receiving which the faithful in the Lord's Supper do verily and indeed take and receive the body and blood of Christ; by presuming to approach which, the wicked (*i. e.* those who with impenitent hearts wilfully purpose to persevere in deadly sin, and yet venture to "take the sacrament") become guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; *i. e.* become guilty of a guilt like theirs who laid hands on His divine person while yet in the flesh among us, or who shed His all-holy blood.

Now, we have been accustomed to value Ante-Nicene Testimonies to the divinity of our Lord; we are struck when S. Cyprian (while deciding as to the baptism of infants on the eighth day) lays down the doctrine of the transmission of original sin as clearly as S. Augustine amid the Pelagian controversy.

Yet the principle of these questions is one and the same.

The argument is valid for all or for none. Either it is of no use to show that Christians, before the Council of Nice, did uniformly believe in the divinity of our Lord, as the Church has since; or it is a confirmation of the faith, that they did receive unhesitatingly in their literal sense our blessed Lord's words: "This is **My** body."

This argument from the consent of those who had handed down the truth before them, was employed as soon as there were authorities which could be alleged. So rooted was the persuasion, that certain truth must have been known to those who received the faith from the first, that even heretics resorted to the argument, and garbled and misrepresented the fathers before them, in order to bring them to some seeming agreement with themselves. The argument was used by minds in other respects of a different mould. Theodoret and S. Leo appended to works on controversial points of faith citations from the fathers before them. S. Augustine vindicated against Pelagius, and S. Athanasius against Arius, authorities which they had misrepresented. Even the fathers, assembled from the whole world in general councils, have, in proof of their decisions, wherein all were agreed, alleged the authorities of yet older fathers, who were known in previous ages to have handed down the Apostolic truth.

Yes, along the whole course of time, throughout the whole circuit of the Christian world, from east to west, from north to south, there floated up to Christ our Lord one harmony of praise. Unbroken as yet lived on the miracle of the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit from on high swept over the discordant strings of human tongues and thoughts, of hearts and creeds, and blended all their varying notes into one holy unison of truth. From Syria and Palestine and Armenia, from Asia Minor and Greece, from Thrace and Italy, from Gaul and Spain, from Africa Proper and Egypt and Arabia and the Isles of the Sea, wherever any Apostle had taught, wherever any martyr had sealed with his blood the testimony of Jesus, from the polished cities or the anchorites of the desert, one Eucharistic voice ascended: "Righteous art Thou, O Lord, and all Thy words are

truth." Thou hast said, "This is My body, this is My blood." Hast Thou said, and shalt not Thou do it? As Thou hast said, so we believe.

Truly, O Lord, "Thy holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge Thee." ;

---

#### ART. II.—SOCIALISM AND SOCIAL SCIENCE.

---

BY REV. THEODORE APPEL, PROFESSOR IN FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

---

THE subject of socialism is an extensive, as well as a profound one, and we can speak of it here only under its more general aspects. This can be best done, we think, by taking a brief survey of the socialistic movements of the past, pointing out their actual end or aim, and then showing the possibility, necessity and importance of what may be properly denominated social science.

Socialism is as old as society itself; for no sooner is society organized than a sense of its evils and imperfections is awakened, and reflection becomes active to devise some means by which they may be removed. The evils in the social organism are not only patent to the eye, but are far spread and deeply felt. Physical distress is produced by the unequal distribution of wealth; pride, selfishness and egotism are cherished by one class of society: envy, jealousy, hatred, suspicion, or despair and despondency, by the other. Such antagonistic elements necessarily must frequently come into collision, and the result is the long-continued oppression of the weaker class by the stronger and more powerful. Such a state of things ought, if possible, to be remedied. Plato attempted to do it by an abstract dream or theory. He constructed an ideal state of society, which notwithstanding its faults, has been the admiration of



all succeeding times. Among other things, he regards the possession of private property as the source of all the evils in the state, of avarice, haughtiness, and meanness. Hence he allows property only to the lower classes of citizens, who have no part whatever in the government. The ruling classes, civilians and warriors, must submit to a community of goods and of wives, since the possession of any private property or even of a separate family, is incompatible with a philosophical ideal of perfection and true patriotism. This is a single specimen of ancient theoretical socialism; but it was by no means something isolated or separated from history or the spirit of the times. It is the representative of a wide-spread and deeply-rooted sentiment in the ancient world, extending from India in the East to the extreme West. All heathenism is essentially dualistic, and unable to reconcile the contradiction between the divine and the human, between matter and spirit! It places this antagonism in man, and regards the soul as essentially good, the body or matter as essentially evil. Hence the highest virtue consists in the ascetic mortification of all sensual and natural appetites. This principle enters into, and gives life to all the old forms of socialism. The gymnosophists of India, who regarded it as a merit to live naked in the woods, and the Pythagoreans, before the time of Plato, whose social organization was based on a community of goods, the Jewish Therapeutæ in Egypt, the Essenes on the shores of the Dead Sea, and other communistic societies, all derived their vitality essentially from the same source, a mistaken idea that matter was the seat of evil, and that felicity could be secured by waging war against it and thus attaining to a state of pure spirituality. Christianity, as we shall see, introduced a new and healthful principle of social reform into the world, but it did not drive out at once the old leaven of heathenism, nor has it done so even up to the present day. The old dualism, or antagonism between matter and spirit remained, and gave rise to the sect of Manicheans, whose principle of reform extended far and wide, beyond the professed disciples of Mani. The Church itself, whilst it always and firmly held the doctrine of the Incarnation, which is the effica-

cious cure for all Manichean and Gnostic errors, and sought to encourage a true Christian asceticism, suffered the old heathen asceticism more or less to intrude itself within its pale. The scriptural antithesis of spirit and flesh, of the kingdom of God and of the world, was confounded at an early period with the ancient antagonism of spirit and matter; and passages of Scripture were employed to serve an asceticism, which virtually turns the body of man into a creature of the devil. Hence the spread of extravagant views concerning the special meritoriousness of self-mortification, of celibacy; and hence the system of external holiness, which has for its aim the complete annihilation of all sensuous appetites, and an absolute flight from the world, as it appears often in the fanatical desire for martyrdom, in monasticism, and the ascetic communism connected with it. The old anchorets in the Egyptian deserts in the fourth century, who sought by poverty and self-mortification their own individual perfection, inaugurated this movement on Christian ground, from a pious Christian motive, with St. Anthony as their leader. About the same time, a wild, erratic and unchristian order arose in Africa, which were much more socialistic than the myriads that gathered around the standard of St. Anthony. The Circumcelliones, as they were called, the first species of mendicant monks, regarded worldly wealth as the root of all evil in the Church; took the part of peasants against the landlords, of the slave against his master, of debtors against their creditors, and carried their fanatical zeal for poverty to such wild excesses, that it was found necessary to suppress them by an imperial edict. Subsequently the wide-spread communistic tendencies of the age became organized in the monastic life, and were placed under the control of the Church. Its aim was, to realize the ideal of ascetic perfection under a social form, through the medium of a communistic organization. It spread with amazing rapidity, both in the East and the West, and excited general admiration throughout the world. Their influence upon society and the world as directed by the Church, was in a dark age in many ways of a most beneficial character; but all these monastic orders and institutions of the mid-

dle ages involved themselves in the flagrant contradiction of commencing in poverty and humility, and ending in extravagance and pride. The very asceticism and moral heroism of their founders gave them reputation and influence; this secured liberal donations, and their growth in wealth was a growth in idleness and dissipation. The Church wisely took these orders under its control and made them subservient to the interests of Christianity; but the tendency, which they represented, could not always be kept within limits, in subjection to the Christian principle. It ran out into various secret orders and combinations, which flourished in darkness and arrayed themselves against both Church and State, the clergy and nobility. Here belong the peasant wars, those popular commotions that ran through the entire middle ages. They started in the spirit and ended in the flesh. They professed to be Christian, but they were in fact political and socialistic in their object and ends. In the 15th century, when strenuous efforts were made within the bosom of the Church to reform itself, an outside heretical opposition spread itself far and wide, and attempted to take into its own hands the reformation of the Church and of human society in general. The "Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit," as they styled themselves, denounced the Church as corrupt, and excited the people against their spiritual leaders; they denied all distinctions, laws and institutions of civil society; and taught that mankind must return to its primitive state in Paradise, that is, to unity with God, which they understood in a pantheistic sense, and to equality among themselves. All government, civil order, private property, marriage, monogamy, the family, they regarded as consequences of sin, which must give way to as complete a community of earthly things, as any dreamed of by modern fanatics. In their efforts to regain the so-called state of Paradise, they preached and carried out in their practice abominable doctrines.

It was the special merit of the Reformation, that it gave a new direction to the general mind of Europe, and turned the religious life from its outward mechanical forms to its proper source in the heart and soul. It thus became a break-water to

the tide of fanaticism, radicalism and licentiousness, which threatened to deluge human society. Had it not been for this barrier providentially set up, the foundations of social order in Church and State probably would have been swept away by the swaying current. It reasserted that the body, matter, or nature is not in itself, evil; that the only evil is sin, which has its seat in the will; and that reformation must proceed from the regeneration of the whole man, and a triumph over egotism as the proper principle of sin. But it was only by degrees, and not without some temporary aberrations that the great moral reformation began to be effected. The wild sect-spirit and politico-religious radicalism of the times received rather an impulse from the boldness of the Reformers in denouncing the corruptions of the times, and broke out in the great Peasant War of the Reformation. "This was political in its origin, although the idea of religious liberty, which it borrowed from the Reformation and misunderstood, attached itself to it and gave it a higher impulse." When this movement had time to disclose its true character, it appeared that it was nothing more than a repetition of what had often occurred before, the old communism, which, straining after and professing a high degree of spirituality, soon toppled over into gross sensuality. As in similar experiments made centuries before, the ruling principle, as proclaimed by Münzer, one of the leaders, was *omnia simul communia*, which implied the destruction of government, of law, of property, of the family, and the most revolting licentiousness.

With the Reformation period the old system of socialism may be said to have come to an end. Its influence on human society resembled that of a tonic; its strained elevation of the spiritual above the material was calculated to preserve the interests of morality against brutish sensualism, and many and imposing were the forms of human character to which it gave rise. Amidst abounding corruption and sensuality, a true Pythagorean, a Platonic, a Stoic, a monk or a hermit, standing up and stemming the tide of iniquity, however vainly, was something respectable certainly, and deserves our admiration in a far higher degree than any other production of antiquity. We

have seen, however, that what promised to the race such celestial flights into the sphere of the spirit, ended in nothing more than a desperate plunge into the depths of a gross and besotted sensuality. This was owing to the fact, that its principle was one-sided; it was purely *theocentric*. Whilst it professed to make supreme account of the divine factor in human progress, it neglected or despised the human, the other factor deeply concerned in every just and legitimate progress of the race.

Modern socialism, involving communism as its necessary attendant and logical consequence, whilst it owes its origin to the same outward causes in society, and produces the same results, differs from those older forms, which we have been considering, in that it does not aim at a complete mastery of the spirit over the flesh by a severe asceticism, but at an emancipation of the flesh from the control of the spirit. It starts in the old dualism; but it proceeds in the inverse order, and either denies the existence of spirit or makes it of subordinate or trifling importance as compared with the claims of the flesh. The ancient system was *theocentric*; the modern is *anthropocentric*. Thus history is made up to a great extent of reactions. The exclusive reign of one idea for a long period of time seems to excite, as it were, a spirit of revenge, and, as if in the way of retaliation, the opposite thought or idea is brought into favor and clothed with power to override and crush its predecessor. Thus socialism for many centuries stood upon one foot and limped, whilst now in our days, as we shall see, it has leapt over and stands on the other. Either position indicates its lameness.

The prophet of modern eudæmonistic anthropocentric humanitarianism is Jean Jacques Rousseau, than whom no author has excited a wider or deeper influence on this age. By a life of sin, lust, and deception, by which he wrought ruin and shame wherever he went, he lost all sense of the spiritual and supernatural; but, with his high intellectual endowments, he felt that he had a higher mission than to wallow in the mire of sensuality. Accordingly he turned philosopher and philanthropist, and, as if in this way he could best cover the infamy of

his private character, he became the great apostle of social reform. His views of education, according to which human nature in itself is essentially good, and only needs training and culture to restore it to a golden age, excited general attention, made an era in the history of education, and gave it an impulse, which is felt down to the present time. His ideal of humanity, divested of religious and moral foundation, together with his theories of human dignity, human rights, human liberty, equality, fraternity and happiness, advocated with great enthusiasm, and clothed in all the splendors of rhetoric, met with an extraordinary response throughout Europe: it carried with it and deceived for the time being some of its noblest minds. The new movement commended itself to all classes of society during the eighteenth century; it was felt to be a needed protest and reaction against the stiff spiritualism and selfish isolation, as manifested in the Church and State, especially in France; and a general enthusiasm prevailed at the advent of these new ideas. Voltaire, and other infidels of the French school, with their negative criticism had done much to pull down the pillars of society, but Rousseau seemed to furnish the world with the necessary positive ideas by which to reconstruct it; hence he had probably more to do in precipitating the French Revolution upon France than any other single man. The first step towards the organization of his humanitarian principle was this awful catastrophe in history in the year 1789. The Revolution was in a great measure socialistic, and gained the adhesion of many good men in its favor in the beginning by the promise it gave of a great social reformation. The occasion of its outbreak was in a great measure the unequal distribution of privileges among the various classes of society and the oppression of the poor. One of the first acts of the Convention, therefore, was the proclamation of the equality of all men. It abolished differences of rank and opened the way of honor to all alike; without however interfering with the right of private property. It abolished the royal power, established a republic, attempted to dethrone God, and substituted human reason in His place. After, however, the storm had spent its force and all the old institu-



tions had been overthrown ; after such an outbreak of iniquity as the world had never before witnessed, many and important results inured to society in France. Many abuses were removed, and many obstacles in the progress of society taken out of the way. Privilege was curtailed. Large estates broken up, and the poor and middle classes allowed an opportunity to accumulate property, and to better their condition. The stiff bigotry of the established Church yielded to reason, and free toleration in religion was secured. Outside of France the Revolution has affected more or less the institutions and ideas of all Europe. The overthrow of the old order of things and the development of the new, intensified the desire for social reform, and gave rise to many socialistic theories, especially in France. They all proceed from the humanitarian principle of the equality of all men, and strive to realize it ; but they diverge into two tendencies, the *socialistic* and the *communistic*, the former of which still adheres to property, while the latter overthrows all right of this kind ; the one is represented by the followers of Count St. Simon and the other by Charles Fourier.

The socialistic tendencies of France have spread to a greater or less extent over Europe, and have had much to do with the late revolutions in Italy and Spain. In England, although socialism in one form or another is coming in like a flood, threatening at no distant day, to wash away its time-honored institutions, its professed advocates are few. The most distinguished among them is Robert Owen, a wealthy manufacturer, and a cotemporary of Fourier. He is a good specimen of anthropocentric eudaemonism, presenting at once its bright and dark sides. He commenced his career by first improving the condition of his own laborers with great liberality and philanthropy, and then attempted to remove the misery of the working classes generally, by a reform of their social condition. For a while he labored for this end by the elevation of the lower classes through means of schools for the poor, the orphan and vagrant children, and enjoyed the sympathy and support of the English people. But the system, based on a false principle, in his case, as in every other case of the same kind, must needs

show its cloven foot. Accordingly, he soon began to attack the Christian religion, the institution of marriage and the family, and declared heaven to be a delusion and earth to be the only end of man ; he thus lost the respect of all sensible people, even before his practical attempt to found a communistic colony in our own country, in the State of Indiana, had proved a failure. In the United States, the socialistic tendencies of the age have embodied themselves in a grand style in Mormonism, a wonderful phenomenon truly, called forth not by a bold theorizer, but still resulting from the humanitarianism of the times, the fruit of that sentiment, which makes mere human nature the starting point of progress.

From this brief, and necessarily imperfect survey of the attempts to solve the social problem in the past, it might appear that there is very little room for faith in anything of the kind. We confess that the prospect is a dreary one, but we have some faith at least, in the ultimate solution of the question. We believe there is here room for *true* science as well as for science *falsely so called*, quite as much so as anywhere else. There is a science of government for nations at large, a science of ethics for individuals, a science of medicine to promote our well-being in a sanitary point of view, a science of law to protect life and property and so on ; why then should there not be also a science of society which shall promote the well-being of communities, or of men in their relation to each other in society ? The object here in view is a good and noble one, and must commend itself to every well-wisher of his species. It proposes to remove the evils and sufferings, which grow out of the social state ; to diminish poverty and crime ; to encourage and assist the humblest individual in elevating himself and in improving his condition ; to invest every person alike with the rights and privileges which belong to him as a human being ; and thus to adorn, beautify and elevate society as a whole ; or, in the simple and expressive language of Abraham Lincoln : "to give to every man, however humble, a *fair start in life*."

It requires only a cursory view to show that the evils of the social state are aggravated and oppressive, and cry out loudly

for intervention and cure. They are the same in our day as they were a thousand years ago. As we have been told, we have the poor with us always, and it would be foolish for us to imagine that any means can ever be devised by which poverty shall be blotted out. Still it has its causes, and many of these may be removed, or the evils and crimes resulting from it diminished. Intemperance, for instance, is one of the most prolific causes of poverty and crime in our own country; but we know that it has been lessened by philanthropic effort. With the adoption of suitable laws and the assistance of a proper police, the sale of intoxicating drinks might to a great extent be prevented. This traffic is a curse to society, and in view of the misery and crime, which it inflicts, ought not to be endured by any community that claims to be respectable, unless it is kept within rigidly legitimate limits. The same is true of other evils that afflict society. Their causes may be removed, or, if not entirely destroyed themselves, they may be greatly mitigated. Wealth, or its unequal distribution, as well as poverty in our day, is the occasion, and often becomes the source of many and aggravated evils. It arms one man with power to oppress and tyrannize over his fellow-man, or combining his means with those of others in like favorable circumstances, he can oppress entire communities, open the avenues to fraud and corruption, set justice and law at defiance, and grind the poor into the dust. Important and necessary as are our great monied corporations, they are not blessings without many admixtures of evil. Capital and labor, it is felt, seldom stand in right relation to each other. Often the maximum of labor is demanded for the minimum of compensation, and on the earnings of the poor laboring man, the rich rolls in luxury, and looks down on him, the creator of his wealth, with scorn and contempt. The evils springing from this source have been lessened, at least to some extent, in the past course of history, as may be seen in the abolition of serfdom in Europe, and slavery in our own country. Why then should we doubt that the remaining evils springing from this source, under the direction of a sound philosophy, may be still further diminished? Closely

connected with the irritating influences of unsanctified wealth are those that have their origin in the spirit of *caste*, which is just as rife here in republican America as in Europe, although it has much less to fall back upon. In enumerating the lists of evils that have fastened themselves upon the social organism, we must not in this place pass over the *wrongs of woman*. It is a long story, and the world by this time ought to know it by heart. But it is certain that it has not, even in Christian countries, been properly laid to heart. The wrongs here spoken of, do not consist in the fact that woman is not allowed to fill the sphere allotted to man, to level the forest, to steer the ship, to stand at the cannon's open mouth on the field of battle, or to rule in the political circles of the country, as is sometimes foolishly imagined; but they consist in another fact, that she is not permitted fully to fill her own sphere, the sphere allotted to her by the Creator. She, in common with man, has a mission to fulfill, which is not confined to earth or earthly things, but extends into eternity. It is, therefore, her right, as well as her duty, to labor with man in promoting all the sacred interests of humanity; to adorn the circle of home and to make it a school of virtue; to be a ministering angel to those in distress; to be a constant follower of Christ in His Church, as she was an attendant on His person whilst He was on earth. She may, as she has often heroically done, labor as a missionary among the heathen on a foreign shore; or at home become the teacher and guide of the young. Nor is she excluded from the sphere of the arts and sciences. Here as well as elsewhere she may be the companion and help-meet to man. She may be an artist, a poet, an author, a philosopher, or a theologian, provided she employs her gifts to beautify, purify and elevate human society. As Dr. Bushnell has well shown in his late work, it is not her province to rule; this as history proves pertains to man with his stronger will; but as the companion, the help, or complement of man, the area of her influence is as broad and wide as his. Here there is room for a true extension of woman's rights, as well as a false and mechanical one. Who does not admire the noble-minded Aspasia, the wife of Pericles, who by her wit

and learning, rivalled her illustrious husband in elevating the tone of society at Athens; or those queens and ladies in the early history of Europe, who first embraced Christianity, then commended it to their heathen husbands, and sought to introduce it among their barbarian subjects? It is a wrong, not only to woman herself, but to society at large, when she is not allowed to discharge the duties and functions of her own peculiar sphere in society. There is room for a reformation here as well as elsewhere, not, of course, in the sense our modern socialists would have it, but in the sense in which a true science of society and of Woman's Rights would dictate.

In all such cases, the reformation aimed at cannot be left to itself without any theory or principle underlying it. Knowledge and science here are as much needed, as in the science of law or medicine. The very fact that socialism hitherto has been based on a falsehood and guided in the interests of infidelity, is the strongest reason, why we should have a social science based on truth and guided by the truth.

A true science of society requires in the first place, a correct knowledge of society itself, or as in the case of all other science, a knowledge of all the facts in the case. The social organization of man is not a mere aggregation of individuals, like so many stones in the walls of a house. If that were so, there would be some ground for that mechanical view of equality, which is so often advocated by the socialistic reformers of the day. Then each individual might, like a stone or brick intended for a wall, be made so many inches long and so many broad, and so be adjusted to his place by an outside builder. But this is not so; society is no such aggregation of parts, but a unity, an organism, pervaded by a common life, and manifesting its vitality by a diversity of organs, each of which has its functions to fulfill. There is an equality here, but not a mechanical one, no more so than there is among the members of the human body. Diversity of sex is the first and most fundamental distinction in society, which cannot be overlooked in any true science of society. This gives rise to the family institution which lies at the foundation of all social well-being and pros

perity. There are also other differences in talent and capacity among the individuals of the community. The diversity here is almost infinite, no two persons having precisely the same talent or tendency. But however diversified the individual endowments may be, they are all adapted in some way or other to promote the general interests. There is a place for each member of the human family, for which he is by nature better qualified than any one else; so that if he be not first at Rome, he may be the first in his country village, or in some still narrower circle of influence and usefulness.

Society regarded as an organism, is something progressive; it must, in order to be in a healthful condition, continually move forward and grow, as in the case of any other living product. Room, therefore, must be made in every theory of society for change, progress and improvement, avoiding on the one hand a dead, petrified conservatism and a violent radicalism, on the other, which strives by violent means to promote growth, irrespective of the true laws of life. As it is one of the chief merits of medical science, to remove obstacles that clog the human system, and so give free play to the living energies of nature, the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, so social science accomplishes much when it points out and insists upon the removal of the evils which press upon the bosom of society, and so prevent it from exercising in an untrammelled way its own living functions. Institutions, which in their day, may have been useful and admirable in their influences upon society, may in the end thus become dead weights upon human progress, and require to be taken out of the way. This is no doubt the state of things at the present time in Europe. Many of its institutions, handed down from the feudal ages, right and proper in their day, are worn out, and ought to be replaced by others. If the voice of a true science is listened to, all will be well; if not, this evil will accumulate, and wars and revolutions will be the consequence. It is not mere fancy to suppose that war with its horrors might, to a great extent, be avoided, if we had correct views of social progress, and statesmen were always able and willing to be guided by correct principles on this vital



subject. English statesmen have been distinguished for their sagacity in this respect for a long time past, and, as a consequence, have frequently repressed civil war among themselves, and immortalized their names by the prosperity which they have inaugurated. Just recently we have had another illustration of their wisdom and foresight in this respect. Their influence and policy, as a consequence, are felt throughout Europe, and no where more so, than in Austria, Italy and Spain, countries which were once the bitterest enemies of heretical Albion.

But whilst society is progressive, and social science must make serious account of this fact, it must also have some fixed principle or law, which shall underlie the movement and control it at every point. Else we should have demoralization, disintegration, and finally, the end or death of Society itself. This can be discovered only by studying the errors and defects of the systems of the past. We have seen that the principle of ancient socialism was *theocentric*, whilst that of modern progress, is *anthropocentric*. They both have truth in them, but as we have seen they are both one-sided. The true principle is the organic union of the two, and is, therefore, not properly speaking either theocentric nor anthropocentric, but *Christocentric*, which includes in one both the divine and human element, just as the divine and human were brought together in organic union in the Incarnation of our divine-human Saviour.

The true principle of social science and social progress is to be found, therefore, in Christianity. It exists there not as an opinion, a speculation, or an abstraction; but as a fact, a power, in the person of Christ, which serves not only as a directory or guide to human progress, but as a new force brought to bear on history, in all respects, comprehensive enough, and sufficient of itself to give society the needed impulse in the right direction.

It is of course not the immediate object of Christianity to promote social reform; it has a higher and holier work to perform in the interests of humanity. Still in its mission of peace on earth and good will towards men, it throws light on the social problem, excites the deepest interest in it and contributes



indirectly to its rational solution. A true Christian Socialism, if such a collocation of terms be allowed in these days, bears in many respects, a resemblance to that which we have been considering; yet, it requires only a cursory examination, to convince us that there is a world-wide difference between the two. By a prejudice and a misinterpretation of Scripture of more than a thousand years' standing, the first Christian congregation at Jerusalem, has been falsely ranked with other communistic organizations, and, it was thus made to give to later monastic orders and a number of mediæval sects their idea of Christian holiness and Apostolic life. The apparent ground on which this mistake rests, is the impression, that the first Christian congregation was communistic in the sense in which that term has been understood in history; but this view has been pretty generally abandoned, since Mosheim, more than a century ago, proved it to be unfounded. In spirit there was at Jerusalem a community of goods, but it was not demanded, neither was it in all cases actualized. Some gave all of their possessions to the Church, and, as in our days, others did not, as appears from the fact, that Ananias was not punished for not having devoted the whole of his property to the Church, but for his duplicity and falsehood.

In like manner it might be shown, that much of the benevolence and many of the reforms of the present day, however much they resemble the fruits of the gospel, are purely natural and human, with nothing spiritual about them. Thus temperance, efforts to benefit the poor, and to diffuse the blessings of education and culture, and other benevolent movements, often move exclusively in the plane of nature. They are good in their place and of much importance to society; but they are only amicable efforts of our poor prostrate humanity, struggling to relieve itself and to hide its own enormities. They stand in no connection with Christ and His Church, and are often advocated most earnestly by those who deny Christ altogether. They flow from the gospel of humanity, as preached by Rosseau, not from the gospel of the kingdom of heaven, as proclaimed by Jesus of Nazareth. Should then all these benevolent move-

ments be condemned as the work of Satan or of one of his apostles? By no means. In their place they are beautiful and desirable, just as civilization and culture are preferable to barbarism. In their proper sphere they are to be praised; but not when they ignore Christianity or attempt to take its place as a new gospel. As Christians, as believers in Christ, it is important that we should understand the signs of the times and not be deceived by appearances. What is born of the flesh is flesh, pure and refined as it may appear, and what is born of the Spirit is spirit. Christ was a reformer as well as a Saviour. He went about doing good to the bodies as well as the souls of men. Who has ever excelled Him in this respect? But He performed all His works of benevolence to make men happier in the world to come, not to create for them a paradise here on earth. He fed the multitude with earthly bread, only in order to have an opportunity to feed them with the bread of eternal life afterwards. Modern reforms do not always do that. In fact, when consistent with their one-sided humanitarian principle, they cannot. This requires that they should adopt the true Christian principle, bring themselves into living union with Christ and His Church, and break with the gay and dissolute apostle of humanity of modern France, whose works and followers are so numerous in our day.

"The appearance of Christ in the world," says Hundeshagen, who has written on this subject, and to whom we are indebted in the preparation of this article, "contains all the elements of a positive renewal of society. The gospel proclaims and confirms the creation of man in the image of God, which is the true nobility of human nature; the essential unity of the entire race, which overthrows all false aristocracy of race and caste, the universal fall and redemption; the establishment of the kingdom of God under Christ the Lord and Head, by which the partition walls of nationality, race, sex, and outward condition are overthrown. Whilst Christianity rises thus above all polytheistic religions and views the human race as a unit, it is equally certain on the other hand, that it never violates the natural basis of human society by overthrowing its necessary outward distinctions, but

aims at an ideal equality, which lies above them in Christ as their common head. The inequalities among men exist by virtue of a divinely established order, and constitute the degrees and members which are necessary for the existence and prosperity of the whole. In their present form, these inequalities are indeed to a great extent the consequence of sin, so that they lead to division, enmity, and rude violence of man against his fellow. But Christianity emancipates the social distinctions from the acute sting of sin and removes those evils, which have their origin in selfishness and pride, covetousness, uncharitableness and idleness, whilst it fills the heart with the spirit of charity and humility, joy and peace, and so sanctifies the different relations and positions of men, that they become so many scales in the service of God, according to the example of Him, who, though He is Lord over all, came to minister and give His life a ransom for many. Thus the Kingdom of God is the Christian reform of society."

---

#### ART. III.—RELIGIOUS ORDERS IN THE CHURCH.

---

IN every religion in the world there is an inner circle, a sort of *sanctum sanctorum*, composed of persons who, for certain special ends and purposes, separate themselves from the world, and join together in the special cultivation of a religious life. India has her ascetics who abandon everything, bury their existence in deserts, and spend day and night in contemplating the soul of God captive in their bodies, from which it is seeking release. Side by side with these Brahmin anchorites are the *cœnobites* of Buddhism, for in China, Tartary, and Japan, there are no priests, but only monks, who live under the law of their respective communities. Monasticism appears also amongst the Hebrews in the last days of the old order, for Judaism had its ascetics in the *Essenes* and *Therapeutæ*: the first, residing

on the shores of the Dead Sea, were devoted to a life of activity ; the second at Alexandria, where they gave themselves to contemplation and prayer, while both classes practiced celibacy and a community of goods, and rejected the use of slaves. "These orders survived the foundation of Christianity, and were known to Pliny the elder, who instanced them as being a people distinguished from all others, 'living without women, abnegating all pleasure, leading an existence of poverty under the palm-tree, . . . thus for thousands of centuries, remarkable fact, has this everlasting nation subsisted, and yet no child is born in its bosom, so profound is its hatred to other modes of life.' "

What thus appears (of course in an abnormal and degraded form, according as the religion is abnormal and degraded) in all other religions, began to manifest itself at an early date in the Christian Church. There are those who find the germs of the peculiar form of life contemplated in religious orders already in the infant Church in Jerusalem, where they "*had all things in common.*" The Church here, in form as well as in spirit, renounces the world, in that they sold their possessions and brought the price and laid it at the Apostles' feet ; and the Church also instituted a peculiar order or brotherhood, in that distribution was made for the wants of the members out of the common treasury. This order of life, however, in its outward form, we know, was temporary. It was established on account of the peculiar emergency, and when this passed away the Christians, though still the same common brotherhood, still renouncing the world, lived in the usual order of human society, following the various occupations, and filling the various stations in life which are common to men generally. Yet, it may still be held that in this temporary state of society in the infant Church, in the days of its first baptism and early love, there was not only an exhibition of that disregard of the world, and that entire devotion to the brotherhood, which should always characterize the Church, but also a prophecy, we think, of what, from time to time should repeat itself in the same form in the history of the Church, until the *mine* and *thine* entirely disappear in the *our* of the Christian brotherhood. In other

words, there are found here the elements of a sound asceticism, and the spirit of special orders or brotherhoods in the Church, as these may be used for the glory of God in every age.

Nay, may it not be said that in the perfectly beautiful life of our Saviour Himself, we have that after which the Church must constantly strive; and as to its form even, its voluntary poverty, obedience, and full detachment from the world, the model after which those to whom it is given should seek to fashion their lives. We see in the Apostolate also this entire separation from the world, and in the case of Paul a life of celibacy for the glory of God. This feature of the Christian life was especially cultivated in the early Church by the peculiar persecutions the Christians were called to suffer, and the unsettled state of their worldly relations, until they at length, found a local habitation on the earth. "Whilst imperiled society was still capable of regeneration, and martyrdom was the condition of the consolidation of the faith, the saints remained in the world to die in the circus or on the pile at the hour appointed by God. As long as persecution lasted, the men were martyrs who would have been anchorites, and it was not till the moment which saw the dissolution of the Roman society that a new order was organized to replace it, and the bands were disciplined, who when Rome had fallen, were to assume her task and reconquer the universe." (*Ozanam—Civilization of the Fifth Century*).

Asceticism, in its best and purest form thus constituted an element of the Christian life, without as yet seeking for itself a separate organization in the Church. At a later period, however, when the Roman empire fell under the power of the Church, and the worldly element began to make inroads upon the piety and devotion of the Church, this element of the Christian life arrayed itself in separate form against the growing evil, and the threatening danger. Thus *Lingard* explains the rise of Monasticism in the Church. "During the first centuries of the Christian era, the more fervent among the followers of the gospel were distinguished by the name of Ascetics. They renounced all distracting employments; divided their time between the public worship and their private devotions; and endeavored by the as-

arduous practice of every virtue, to attain that sublime perfection, which is delineated in the sacred writings. As long as the imperial throne was occupied by pagan princes, the fear of persecution concurred with the sense of duty to invigorate their efforts; but when the sceptre had been transferred to the hands of Constantine and his successors, the austerity of the Christian character was insensibly relaxed; the influence of prosperity and dissipation prevailed over the severer maxims of the gospel; and many, under the assumed mask of Christianity, continued to cherish the notions and vices of paganism. The alarming change was observed and lamented by the most fervent of the faithful, who determined to retire from a scene so hateful to their zeal, and so dangerous to their virtue; and the vast and barren deserts of Thebais were soon covered with crowds of anchorets, who under the guidance of the Saints Anthony and Pochomius, earned their scanty meals with the sweat of their brows, and by a constant repetition of prayers, and fasts, and vigils, edified and astonished their less fervent brethren. Such was the origin of the Monastic institute." (*Lingard's Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*).

Monasticism, starting in individual anchorites, as St. Paul and St. Anthony, soon became organized into communities of cœnobites, and spread first over the entire East. From thence it extended over the West. "In the recesses of the Appenines; in the secluded islands along the coast of Italy; in Gaul, where it had been disseminated by the zeal of Martin of Louis; in Ireland; in the parts of Britain yet unwasted by the heathen Saxons; in Spain; in Africa, these young republics rose in all quarters, and secluded themselves from the ordinary duties, occupations, pursuits, and as they fondly thought, the passions and the sins of men." (*Milman*).

Thus from the beginning onward we find this feature in the history of the Church. It was in every age an arm of strength to the Church, while at the same time it exhibited the excesses and weaknesses of human nature. At the time of the Reformation we find it in full activity in the dominant orders, the Dominicans and the Franciscans. The order of Jesuits, founded by



*Don Inigo de Loyola*, subsequently became an arm of power to Romanism, as it labored assiduously against Protestantism. Down to the present day the religious orders in the Roman Church constitute one of her chief elements of power. In every great city they entrench themselves, and from thence labor with the greatest self-denial for the advancement of the common interest. Through their zeal, liberality, and self-denial, institutions are founded and endowed, publication houses established, periodicals sustained, missions supported. No one indeed can estimate the advantage which the Roman Church secures through them in her contest with her adversaries.

All this, to the view of some, is enough to condemn all religious orders, viz.: that they have been found in the Church always, down to the present, and in *Romanism* since Romanism has been in the world. But we are disposed to look at the subject differently. To us it seems an evidence that there is something in the principle of religious orders which is right and good, that we thus find them existing in every religion, and in every age of the Christian Church. Instead, therefore, of looking upon the subject itself with suspicion, and shunning and suppressing any tendency to employ the same power which Rome employs, we believe it would be wiser in Protestantism to consider whether she is not thus weakening her own powers and depriving herself of what may be an instrument for great good.

What are called *religious orders* contain within themselves two elements, the one, *asceticism*, the other, what we may designate the idea or spirit of *special brotherhoods*.

It needs not to be said that there are degrees of asceticism, and that there is a true and a false asceticism. Asceticism in its simple idea is moral and spiritual self-discipline, in the way of abstinence from what in itself may be lawful in order to strengthen the moral nature. It grows out of a lively sense of the sinfulness of the flesh, of the necessity of subduing the bodily appetites, and of the antagonism between the world and the Kingdom of Grace. In its true nature, such special self-discipline has been employed in every age. In the case of John the Baptist, for instance, it assumed a form corresponding to the



spirit of the Old Testament dispensation, and his own peculiar work as the forerunner of Christ. He had his home in the wilderness, was clothed in camel's hair garments, and had for his food locusts and wild honey. Our Saviour came eating and drinking, yet, even He, too, the Lord of life and glory, disciplined Himself as the great Athlete, for the great conflict with the devil, by fasting forty days and forty nights, having His abode "with the wild beasts." St. Paul was not ignorant of this sort of discipline, as he describes it to us himself in 1 Cor. ix. 24—27: "Know ye not that they which run in a race, run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain. *And every one that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now, they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible. I, therefore, so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air; but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection.*"

No doubt the asceticism of the early centuries of the Christian Church often ran into excess, and also became joined with false views of the Christian life. These excesses may be accounted for in part by the fact that Christianity was confronted with the grovelling worldly tendencies and practices of heathenism. It was, for instance, the degraded condition of marriage among the heathen that led many in the Church to advocate celibacy as a state of superior virtue and holiness. Just as in our own day, the excessive use of intoxicating drink calls forth the counter movement of total abstinence, so these ancient ascetics or abstinent, went often to an extreme; but they must be judged by the circumstances of their times, and the peculiar evils that prevailed around them. No doubt St. Anthony made some mistakes in his application of the words of our Saviour to the rich young man mentioned in the New Testament. He interpreted the words *literally*, "Go and sell all thou hast, and give to the poor, and come follow Me." A wealthy young man himself, when he heard these words, he distributed his goods among the poor and went out to the mountains to wage a conflict with sin and Satan. But if Anthony erred, we would as soon take his chances of salvation as those of many rich young men

in the Church in our day, to whom these words, and those others, "How hardly shall a rich man enter the Kingdom of Heaven," are as an idle tale.

It is not our purpose, however, to consider asceticism as exercised by separate individuals in its bearing on personal piety. We refer to it as an element entering into the life of the religious communities, which multiplied and prevailed so extensively through the past ages of the Church. As entering into the discipline of these communities, it was one of the conditions of their strength and success. As they devoted themselves to a life of special piety and sanctity, they needed a special discipline, especially in view of the peculiar temptations that would meet them. The forming of a system or code for the government of communities that were destined to become so great a power, to exert so great an influence, and to perform so great a work for the Church, required, indeed, great wisdom and even genius. Such wisdom and genius were displayed by a St. Pacomius, a St. Basil, in the East, and by a St. Jerome, and St. Augustine, for the West, and other leaders in the Church. So far as the cultivation of personal sanctity merely was concerned, this discipline was of direct and immediate importance; but in so far as these religious orders in subsequent times laid out for themselves a special work for the Church, their discipline looked indirectly to this end. If, for instance, a special work was to be done among the heathen, such an order would undertake it with the advantages of their strict government and discipline, and with few of the impediments which fell in the way of others undertaking a like work. Surely, in this view, no one can condemn the principle on which sacrifices may be made. If, in order to labor efficiently for the Lord, it is necessary that the brotherhood shall form no family ties, shall espouse a life of poverty and of obedience, who will object to such self-denial, for such an end?

Let us proceed, however, to consider the second element named as entering into religious orders, viz: that of a special brotherhood, *the principle of association for special purposes.*

This is a principle which belongs to man's social nature.

Strength is secured for doing any given work by the sympathy and coöperation of an association. We speak now of associations of a more particular kind than the State or the Church.

The Church is the highest, purest, and best brotherhood for man, in which the social principle of our nature finds its fullest satisfaction. But in the Church, and under the direction and control of the Church, there is still a need for particular organizations, or societies, for specific purposes. This want in the community in general gives rise to societies of an almost endless variety. Even apart from the necessity of associations that are more immediately connected with business, or politics, or literature, we have societies for mutual charity, for cultivating mutual sympathy, &c. Who can name or enumerate them all?

Now what thus expresses itself in the world, seeks for expression also in the Church. A certain work is to be done, and certain persons feel called to do it. Their aims and tastes are similar, they feel moved by the same call, and they join together to work mutually for a common end. Who does not see that there is power here? Isolated and alone each of the members of the association could accomplish little or nothing. He would grow disheartened. But unite the efforts and the sympathies, and you soon find a power which supports each of the members, and strengthens him for the accomplishment of the desired end.

This principle of association, as it inheres in our nature, enters into the religious orders in the Church. But now these orders possess certain features by which, after all, they are distinguished from such societies as we find around us ordinarily in Protestantism, Missionary Societies, Tract Societies, Young Men's Christian Associations, &c. Let us notice and examine this difference, with a view to ascertain whether religious orders can be used by Protestantism.

These Societies in Protestantism, for the most part, are not under the immediate direction and control of the Church, and they do not contemplate nor provide for a "religious life" (using this phrase now in its technical sense) on the part of their

members, nor for the support of those who are leading such a life. Religious orders as they have prevailed in the Church are under the control of the Church, and provide, as a rule, for a life of special consecration to a particular work for the Church.

That they should be under the control of the Church we regard as an essential feature in their character. It is not enough that they should be composed of persons who are members of the Church. This alone is not sufficient to keep the organization, especially as it grows numerous and influential, from falling into temptation and error. As such societies profess to be doing a work for the Church, they should be guided and directed by the Church. At least they should always be so related, that the Church can sit in judgment to approve or condemn.

That they should provide also for a special consecration, in what is called a *religious life*, is also important and necessary.

The great body of the members of the Church cannot make their consecration in just this form, because the Church, while it is not of the world is, nevertheless, in the world. They must engage in the various avocations of life. Christianity does not call men generally from these, but only sanctifies them for their use. But while this is true of the great body of Christians, it is equally true that there are always those who are called to a life of service directly for the Church, and separate from all the callings of the world. That this principle is conceded, we need only instance the holy ministry. They constitute an *order*, by divine appointment. They are consecrated for life to one work, and that a work which belongs not to this world. They are separated from the world, and set apart for the one great work of the ministry. Their real power depends largely on their realizing this feature of their calling, viz: that they stand forth as separate from the world, while they live and move and labor in it. There is a great mistake prevailing just on this point in the views commonly entertained of the ministry. It is generally held that they have power for their work in proportion as they enter into the world's life, and are carried in its currents. The sociable minister, who joins in feasting and mirth, who demeans himself outwardly as other men, who takes

interest in politics and business, who can therefore talk intelligently with his people on *these* subjects, who can perhaps acquire property, and even wealth, and show his people an example as to what ought to be done with riches,—this is the minister of our day. He is on the streets, often in the shops and stores, attending worldly meetings, and taking part in worldly matters generally. We hold that he is *weak* also in proportion as he gives himself up to a life of this sort.

Our Saviour is sometimes referred to as an example of this kind of religious life. But this is a great mistake. He was of all men most unworldly. He had no property, condescended to live on the charities of His friends, meddled not in affairs of business, of politics, of social economy, nothing of a mere worldly character, except as His holy religion came to baptize it all and consecrate it to the glory of God. No, the minister's true power lies just in his entire separation from the world, while he mingles freely in it.

This element of detachment from the world which enters into the ministerial calling, enters also into societies which are called *religious*. They must also be consecrated to the particular work for the glory of God to which they have devoted themselves, whether in the work of missions, of acts of mercy and charity, of Christian Education, or whatever may be the special calling.

Protestantism has well nigh lost all such organizations. Their schools have been, for the most part handed over to the state, as also their poor, their sick, their orphans. There is hardly any religious work left which calls for a class of persons specially consecrated for it. What does all this argue? Does it not show that the specific work of the Church has, to an alarming extent, been given up to the world? And is not the result of it a growing worldliness on the part of the Church itself?

There can be no question that Protestantism has suffered, and still suffers terribly just from this cause. Only recently is there an awakening to the evil, and now there are indications of a disposition to lay hold of the specific work which is committed to the Church, but which so largely has been given over to the world. An *order of deaconesses* has been established in some

Protestant Churches, after the example of the Apostolic Church. This makes room to some extent at least for a special religious work for many women who perhaps have longed for the opportunity to labor in some special way for the Church. The question is agitated in many sections of the Church, in which there is a sense of need in this direction, but in many cases a fear prevails lest to pursue such a course might be a falling into the deadly error of Romanism. The establishment of such an order in the Protestant Church would be a testimony for the high prerogative and calling of woman, worth a thousand-fold more than all the ado made about giving woman the grand prerogative of casting a vote into the ballot box. She is not only an equal of man, but a co-worker in the heavenly work of the holy ministry.

But in order to make this calling effective, it must have a special consecration. The mere appointment of a *Committee* of ladies in a congregation to visit the poor and the sick, is not sufficient. We hear it sometimes said that Protestant congregations develop quite as much special consecration to a life of charity and mercy, on the part of their female members, as Romanism with all its orders of nuns and sisters of charity. We do not question it. We would be badly off if we could not say this much. But does Protestantism recognize and give power, as it might and ought, to this consecration? That is the question. Let such as are called to this work, and are in circumstances to perform it, be organized, appointed, consecrated,—let them in short be recognized and set apart by the Church for this work, and see how greatly their power will be increased. Let them have the benefit of promise and pledge, and the benediction of the Church,—let them have and enjoy a recognition corresponding to that awarded to elders and deacons, and the blessed results will soon appear in the increased efficiency of this kind of work in the Church.

To make this great work of mercy efficient it should be brought under general regulations. Why should the Church not afford the opportunity for a training suited to this work? Must Romanism monopolize the field here, so that sisters of



charity can go out only from her communion, to sit by the bedside of the sick and dying? Let an epidemic prevail, or even an unusual amount of sickness, and see how poorly Protestantism is provided for the work here called for. This fact among others, no doubt, has led the world, with its societies or orders, the Freemasons, Odd Fellows, Red-Men, &c., to undertake this work. Members of these orders come and sit up with and nurse the sick of their societies, not because they have more charity, but because they provide for this by their organization.

Sometimes it seems as if there were no demands of this kind as society is now organized, but the need for it can only be developed when the provision is made to meet it. Many a minister, no doubt, who leaves the visiting of the sick to others, finds little call for this kind of work; but let him once enter seriously upon it, and he will soon find that he needs assistance, especially such as woman could render. Until of late the Reformed Church realized no demand or call for providing for orphans. They were provided for in some other way here or there, often in the Poor-house, it is true; but when the Church opened her Orphans' Home, it was soon filled with orphans. This work is coming to require the services of those who are willing to devote their lives to this kind of Christian labor. It needs female workers as well as males.

Take again the work of *Missions*. You have here a work which differs from the work of the ordinary pastorate. It requires a special grace, and a special calling, as it brings also special trials and calls for special self-denial. He, who engages in it must be willing to be separated perhaps from a settled life in an old community, and go to the borders, where society is just establishing itself. Or, he may be called to commence work in a crowded city. His work is peculiar in its character. He needs special preparation for it, and a special consecration. But missionaries constitute a *class*. Why should they not have the advantage of an organization, and the encouraging and supporting sympathy of the society? Or if a certain class of young men should desire to consecrate them



selves, under a certain government, to this work, leaving family relationships, and property, for a longer or shorter period, why should they not be encouraged to go out as a brotherhood with the benediction of the Church?

Again, we may specify the work of Christian education, as a work which requires a class of persons specially trained for it. From the Seminary and College down to the common parish schools, the work invites laborers who have a vocation for it. If we are ever to have *Parochial Schools*, their establishment and maintenance will depend just on an order or class of devoted servants of Christ who are willing to work in this peculiar sphere. It must be done as a religious work, not a secular, worldly one. It must be done as the work of the holy ministry is done, not for worldly gain, not as a pursuit or profession, but as a *calling* or *vocation* for the glory of God.

But it is not our purpose to specify the manner and form in which religious orders or societies may be organized in Protestantism. We merely wish to point out some fields which invite self-denying labor, and in which labor may be the more efficient in proportion as the laborers are detached from all worldly callings and associations. These orders would differ from those in the Roman Church, as Protestantism differs from Romanism. They would be divested, of course, of certain elements that have become connected with, if they have not entered into, the religious orders of the Roman Church.

Asceticism in its false character, as it looks upon the bodily appetites as sinful *per se*, as it finds a merit in bodily abstinence without reference to a moral end, as it believes in works of supererogation, as it leads its subjects to the top of a pillar, or into the caves of the mountain,—asceticism in this sense could not enter into Protestant orders. Monasteries, monks and nuns, these are *institutions* of Romanism, and cannot be reproduced by that portion of the Church which has repudiated Romanism. Protestantism cannot produce a Benedict, a Dominic, a St. Francis, or an Ignatius de Loyola. But does it follow that Protestantism dare not trust itself to wield the same powers, consecrated by *her* religion, that these leaders wielded

for *their* Mother Church? We do not believe it. On the other hand we believe that a feature which is found in all religions, and which has formed an element of strength for the Church in every age, may be a feature also of the Protestant Church, without compromising one iota of her principles.

It may, indeed, be asked why, if this be the case, *has* not Protestantism had such orders? Is it not an evidence that religious orders are contrary to the Protestant spirit and principles, that she has not introduced them? To this we may reply, Protestantism has shown her need of them, and has made attempts to institute and use them, though in a modified form. Her numerous societies, to which we have already referred, show this. Missionary Societies, or Boards of Missions, Tract Societies, Bible Societies, Colporteurs, besides the many other societies and agencies of this character, all serve to show the power of the principle here at work. So, too, there have been associations or enterprises which more nearly conform to the spirit of religious orders as they have prevailed for centuries, such as the Religious House for the training of Deaconesses, Mission Houses, Orphan Homes, &c. These often start in the labor and self-denial of one man. Not to speak of the movement in this direction in the Church of England, what is the Mission Institute of the Baptist Spurgeon, in London, but a spontaneous out-cropping of this principle of special work, through a special vocation? He has formed an organization which is accomplishing an immense work of its kind in the city of London. This is not very unlike what Father Hecker, at the head of the *Paulist Fathers*, an *order* in Romanism, is doing in New York, the metropolis of the New World.

But the argument itself is invalid. We cannot conclude that Protestantism ought not to do anything which she has not hitherto done, nor that a kind of work is repugnant to her true spirit because she has not yet fully entered upon it. Protestantism cast aside some things which she found in Romanism, merely because they *were* found there. There are elements of the life of the Church, thus for a time passed by, and even repudiated, it may be, which will yet be reproduced in the free

spirit of Protestantism. This process is going on every day. Things that were once bitterly condemned, are now freely received. We need only instance the style of architecture, which, in denominations farthest removed from Romanism, Methodist, Baptist, &c., so nearly resembles the Gothic churches of the English or Roman Church, that one often mistakes them for the latter. On the spires of these Methodist or Baptist, or even Presbyterian, churches, may be seen, too, that sign, so much feared for a time, *the cross*.

The same thing is true in regard to doctrine and cultus. Protestantism does not surrender any principle, but she feels that she can without danger take to her bosom all that is good and true in Romanism. She could not do this so well at first. Time was needed to confirm and settle her principles. During this period things might be dangerous which are not when once she is grown strong and established. But now, all denominations are turning back to the Reformation, with a view to gather up *all* that legitimately belongs to Protestantism, as a continuation of the one, holy, catholic, Church of Christ.

We believe the same is true in regard to the subject before us. Protestantism has now her societies, which are designed to be as hands for the Church. But these societies lack certain elements, which are needed to render them truly efficient. Or, perhaps we may say, Protestantism needs to take up and incorporate certain elements before she can produce religious orders adapted to her wants, and which will be efficient to do the work she needs to have done. Let us, in conclusion of this article, note what these elements are.

1. We mention, first, a deeper sense of the antagonism or antithesis between the order of this world and the kingdom of grace. The tendency of Romanism is to antagonize these in a wrong sense. Roman asceticism tends to Montanism or Manicheism. Christians are not to look upon the body and its appetites as evil *per se*, nor are they to flee away from the world into the deserts, under the vain imagination that they thus escape the evil. Romanism has looked too much upon the secular as having no affinity for the order of grace. Accord-

ingly its relation to the world comes to be Pharisaic and tyrannical. We see this in her treatment, for instance, of the state, of marriage, &c.

But it must not be forgotten that there is peril in the opposite direction, viz., in making too little account of the antagonism between these two. Christianity is *in* the world, and *for* the world, in that it takes up and saves all who comes to it for salvation. But it saves it really and fully only in *its* order, that is, in the order of Christianity. Beyond the Church, there is, it is true, a conservative power for all the relations of life going out from Christianity; but this amounts to nothing more than a keeping of the world from final doom while the work of grace is going forward. What is beyond this work of grace as it goes forward here, must come in the second advent and the final conflagration, the resurrection and the new heaven and new earth. The early Church had a lively sense of this, as they imbibed the spirit of Christ. He set His people the example, first, of a life of separation from the world. He manifested but little concern for the world in its own sphere, so far as any power to benefit itself was concerned. The state, government, school, science, art, the family, all these to Him were involved in the one helpless misery, and nothing to save could come from them. The one great question which interested Him was that the world should come to believe in Him, and find salvation in Him. The early Church, we say, had a lively sense of this, and it led them to join with all their work for the world, a constant looking for the second Advent. Now, it is easy to see how such a spiritual posture would lead Christians to live as though they expected little from this world, but all from Christ. There is an element in Protestantism which is of a different spirit. The humanitarian tendencies of our age look directly in an opposite direction really for salvation. These tendencies regard the world as capable of salvation in its own sphere, and as needing only certain helps from Christianity to enable it to work out fully its own mission, its own redemption. The family, the school, the state; intelligence, these are the powers that bring salvation is to, and all they need be

strengthened and confirmed by such views and principles of life as Christianity presents for consideration. How far the Protestant Church is drawn into this spirit, we do not pretend to say. But we believe that much of the intermingling of the Church with the world rests, consciously or unconsciously just in this false spirit. Protestantism is becoming secularized to an alarming extent. The ministry, losing faith in the presence and power of the supernatural, reach out after, and cling timidly to, the world. How many allow themselves to engage in worldly enterprises and worldly speculations! In how many ways do they become entwined with the world's associations! And this, too, under the plea that the minister must mingle freely in the world, as Christ did when He ate even with publicans and sinners! The laity, necessarily, drink in the same spirit. The awful rush of business, the maddening whirl of pleasure, the gilded bauble of worldly ambition, these are the powers that come to take away the crown from many a child of grace.

Allow that Protestantism, as a higher, freer stadium of Christianity, is to come nearer to the world, and mingle more freely with it, yet this is to be done only with the greater sense of the antagonism between the two. Now, the societies through which Protestantism performs her work must possess this sense, in order that they may be effective workers. Education Societies, and Boards, and Young Men's Associations, and Bible and Tract Societies, that work as business houses merely, erecting mammoth buildings, dispensing funds,—all this will not do the work, for while all this is going on the Church fails to fill up the ranks of the ministry, she cannot educate her own children, her orphans are under the care of the state, and missionaries cannot be found to labor in the mission fields. What Protestantism needs, is a body of men and women who will consecrate themselves in a special way to self-denying labor, as those who expect no help from the world for its salvation, but who are sent to bring it salvation from a higher world. Such workers are needed to do ministerial work, and also in spheres outside the ministry proper. There are hundreds and thousands of

Protestant Christians, men and women, who cannot enter the ministry, whose hearts yearn to enter the service of the Church in some way, so that they can give all they have and are to the work. These the Church should organize, or open the way to recognize their organization, and thus secure the fruits of their labors.

II. Protestantism in the way indicated, should hold herself ready to encourage and support what we may call special *vocations* in her members. Men have callings in the vineyard of the Lord, and these callings are various according to the various necessities of the times, and the special gifts with which Christians are endowed. Of course the one special *calling* is that to the Holy ministry. But this calling itself has a variety of gifts,—for “He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers.” These gifts point to different kinds of ministerial labor. Among them surely must be included the missionary endowment, the gift of governing and overseeing, &c., and thus we would have men in the ministry who would consecrate themselves to special work. But special gifts are bestowed also on men and women among the laity. Why should not such vocations be turned to account? Some of these have a peculiar calling to labor in a particular direction in a congregation, others in a large field.

There is, indeed, room for the exercise of special gifts as things are in the Church. Much of the work that is done, many of the enterprizes that are started, can be traced to some one individual, but we believe attention is not sufficiently directed to this, nor sufficient provision made to recognize and encourage it. Often the course of such as feel themselves called to a particular work is confused and impeded by the difficulties surrounding our processes of legislation. To take hold of an enterprise by legislative bodies, such as classes or synods, often retards rather than advances it.

But why, it may be asked, cannot the individual, having the vocation go forward and do the work to which he is called as things now are? Simply because the Church is not in proper condition to recognize such vocation, and throw around it her



fostering care and benediction. Hence in Protestantism great and good enterprizes often are started by individuals, and flourish for a time, and then pass out of the possession and control of the Church. From the start it was the work of an individual and not truly and fully of the Church, and it *was* this because the Church did not recognize the work as her own, take it under her care, and thus secure it, and make it permanent. The life and wants of the Church, indeed, come to their expression, not only in synodical acts, but in individual vocations. From these may come Orphan Homes, and Mission Houses, Hospitals, and Schools, or some other interest. How helpless we are, for the most part, especially in the cities, in reference to these interests, and how largely the work of charity and mercy is given over into the hands of the state!

III. Protestantism, or rather Protestant Churches, should recognize, control, and foster *organizations*, having in view special service for the Church. The Church, as such, finds it difficult to carry out her plans by direct agency. Even in congregations, much work could be done that is otherwise left undone, if some proper organization or organizations existed. Many members of the Church spend time and money in societies outside the Church, which could be used to far more advantage in the Church? Even ministers are found in these world-organizations. There is a want to be satisfied; but why could it not be satisfied in the Church. Instead of Free Masons, Odd Fellows, Red Men, &c., let us have Societies, Brotherhoods, &c., *in* the Church. So in the denomination at large. We venture the assertion that more go from members of the Church into such worldly societies than into the Church itself. Surely there is a wrong here. The Societies that exist do not meet the wants of the case, for they are not strictly in and under the Church, and they lack a sufficient bond of union. After a time they run into mere business affairs, managed by a few, while the membership at large cease to feel an interest in the work.

In the course of this article we have referred to several interests, which, it seemed to us, needed to be carried forward



by the aid of some organizations, which shall devote themselves specially to them. They are of so great importance that we refer to them once more at the close of our article.

First, *The Work of Home Missions*. It has been tried by *Boards*; they are good in their place. Let there be, in addition, a *Religious House*, a special training, and a *Brotherhood*. Many a young man, from the Seminary, would enter such brotherhood, to labor wherever he might be sent, and at any sacrifice; but without it, he looks with dismay to the *far West*, and hesitates, because there is none to *send* him, and to whom he would be joined in a common work.

Second, *Christian Education*. We need a band of workers to consecrate themselves to this work—not as a secular occupation, but as a religious service for the Church. All over the Church they should be at work, organizing and maintaining *Parochial Schools*. Let this interest be taken hold of in this way. Train your men and women for it, and see if it is not practicable to keep up *Church Schools*.

Third, *The Mission of Woman in the Church*. The problem is calling forth the earnest attention of the Church, as well as the community generally. Let our daughters be religiously educated, in Seminaries of the Church, and let the way be opened to train such as may have the vocation to labor entirely for the Church. Call them Deaconesses, Sisters of Mercy, or what you will. Only open the way for woman to do earnest work in all such ways as she is qualified for, and she feels called, and you will give a better solution of the question of Woman's Rights than the world is seeking after.

ART. IV.—THE PERICOPES, OR SELECTIONS OF GOSPELS AND  
EPISTLES FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.

—  
NO. II.  
—

BY E. E. HIGGEE, D.D.

IN our previous article, we maintained that the selection of the pericopes was not arbitrary,—not the work of some gifted individual, following merely his own private impulse and judgment,—but, on the contrary, determined throughout by the habitual practice of Christendom,—an outgrowth of the faith and life of the Church itself. The Creed, the Church Year, with the old selection of pericopes pertaining thereto, and the old liturgies throughout, all, stand in the same atmosphere of faith, and show the presence of the same profound apprehension of the mystery of grace, to which each in its way gives utterance. They follow the same scheme or order: and this order here is in no sense mechanical or outward, but controls with the force of an inward law belonging of necessity to the evolution of the redemptive mystery itself.

We can conceive of a year made up of appointed seasons of thanksgiving and fasting, of varying weeks of prayer and conferences, with skilfully selected portions of Scripture to suit each specific end: but all this, however important it may be felt to be, falls vastly short of the old Church Year and its pericopes. The two differ very much in the same way as a modern programme embracing theological points of agreement, differs from the old "*regula fidei*," the Apostles' Creed. The one centres throughout upon the objective mysteries of grace, and follows of necessity the order of the Creed: the other follows subjective, religious impulse, and centres upon some specific, accidental interest. It is not difficult for any one to feel

this difference, especially when the two systems come into antagonism. They cannot be made for any length of time to play into each other. They are found, in fact, to be irreconcilable, because they are not of the same spirit, have not the same principle, and belong not to the same order of Christian thought.

It is in this view that an examination of the old pericopes, as related to the Church Year and to the liturgical services of the early Church, has been regarded by us as of great practical account. To study their inward relations, to mark their general organization, and to apprehend their theological significance in this form, are well worth the time which may be devoted thereto. Hence we hesitate not to continue our previous article, giving first a brief summary of what has gone before.

---

In the Creed, immediately following the conception and birth, we have the suffering, crucifixion, death, and burial of Christ, not as so many historical incidents merely in the life of Christ, but as mysteries for faith, belonging necessarily to the unfolding of the great central, redemptive mystery of the Incarnation itself. Just as the conception by the Holy Ghost moves forward into a real human birth, linking thus the supernatural to the very constitution of the world's life; just so, also, from this, does the same mystery move forward in the way of a real human existence into the bosom of our fallen history, to wrestle with its awful curse through death and hades, not of course to a termination of itself in death, but to a full assertion, in the midst of this, of its redemptive power and glory, as revealed at last in the triumphant issue of the resurrection from the dead and the ascension to the right hand of the Father.

Now, as we have maintained, this necessary and sublime order of the Creed is that which governs the Church Year from the very beginning; and the selection of the accompanying pericopes is controlled throughout by the same. The Creed commences, it is true, with "*God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth;*" and by some this may be regarded as in-

consistent with the structure of the Church Year, demanding for this latter, at the outset, a *Theological* rather than a *Christological* beginning. The Church, however, never regarded this first article of the Creed as implying that God through the creation reaches a full revelation of Himself as challenging faith. On the contrary, the Church saw the full revelation of God as Creator, only in the mystery of His only-begotten and incarnate Son, in Him "who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, \* \* \* \* \*; all things were created by Him and for Him; and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist." The Creed refers us to no vision of God through nature, in the interest of natural deism; but to the vision of God in Him towards whom the whole creation looks, and in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and in whom also the sense of the whole creation, physical, rational, and spiritual, is brought to a proper revelation.

In full harmony, therefore, with the Creed do the pericopes begin the sacred year with the *Advent* series, in which the whole economy of nature and revelation is viewed as looking towards the mystery of Christ's coming, as towards the centre of its whole process,—the full, heavenly, response to all its wants and aspirations, its types and prophecies, its whole moral and religious development,—the new creation, in which the old is comprehended and carried onward to its consummation in such form that God, the Creator, is declared and seen as never before. So also in the same series, all present history is made to look to His second coming as the full, heavenly answer to its whole movement, because thereby is completed in time that great mystery of redemption which, in the first coming, apprehended the world, and is now carrying it onward to such issue of judgment and glory. This is the meaning of the Advent series, joining the beginning and end of the whole creation in sublime synthesis in Christ, the Alpha and Omega of the universe.

In the Nativity series, in immediate relation to this, we have

this coming itself. The Word,—the source and substance of the whole finite order from the beginning, as well as the full articulate utterance of God,—the light and life, making a pathway through the world's suppressing darkness,—at last becomes flesh, by a real human birth links Himself organically with the constitution of the world, and dwells among men, revealing in Himself the Father, being the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person. In the octave of the Nativity—the circumcision—as the child of Mary, He passes sacramentally into a birth-inheritance of the Old Testament supernatural economy, which contained for Him, and for the world, the whole reality of all antecedent divine revelation among men.

In the Epiphany series, the same hallowed mystery moves forward, authenticating and manifesting itself among men by attestations from on high,—the Star, and the opened heavens at His baptism,—and by attestations from within, as the theanthropic consciousness of Christ begins to assert itself at the Temple, and as afterwards He manifests forth His glory in works and words. This manifestation, however, is in the bosom of our fallen humanity. It could in no sense actualize itself here without first breaking through the barriers of the world's false life, overthrowing the empire of Satan, and gaining for itself, through victory, dominion and glory. The Epiphany of Christ, therefore, of necessity arrayed against Him the whole empire of darkness. He challenged by His very presence the terrible conflict. Claiming for Himself, against the tempting and usurping adversary, the headship of all principality and power, He wrests from his hands the keys of death and hades. Bearing in our humanity the curse, He exhausts it. Dying, He transcends the whole law of death; and Himself the high priest, offers up His body on the altar of the Cross, making through the power of His endless life both the priesthood and the sacrifice, and all the attending facts, of perennial virtue and efficacy for the world.

This mystery of conflict, this solemn labor and warfare of the Captain of our Salvation, reaching out into death and hades, fixes for the Church Year the season of the Quadragesimal fast.

And what is this whole movement but the order of the Creed, authenticating itself in all the services of the Church, and finding a practical utterance and embodiment for itself among God's people? What else does it indicate other than the blessed repose of faith in the perennial power and significance of these Creed-mysteries throughout all ages in the Church?

But, to resume. The pericopes, looking towards this Quadregesimal season in way of preparation, close, as we have said, with the Sunday in Quinquagesima. They are especially adapted to deepen in the mind of the Church a sense of that necessary conflict between the life of the world and that of grace, and a sense of the consequent danger also in which every Christian, while surrounded with temptations and with the powers of evil, is involved, whenever striving to manifest the reality of his heavenly birth in grace. The selection is of such a character throughout as to open the way for the Ash-Wednesday proclamation of the fast, by steadily enforcing the solemn import of a full detachment from the whole order of the world's life, so that in temptations and trials, in labors and warfare, the child of God may have power to turn from the vain pomp and pleasures and remedies of this present world, and find his rest and support and delivering strength in the powers of the world to come,—powers which are made to confront him in the continuing efficacy of just those mysteries which the pericopes in harmony with the Creed bring to the vision of his faith. No language can better express the purpose here, or more beautifully bring before us the whole order through which the pericopes move, than that of the old Litany. "*By the mystery of Thy holy incarnation; by Thy holy nativity and circumcision; by Thy baptism, fasting and temptation; by Thine agony and bloody sweat; by Thy precious death and burial: Good Lord, deliver us!*"

Ash-Wednesday is the proper proclamation of the Quadregesimal fast, called therefore in the Liber Comitis, "*caput jejunii*," and by the Greeks, "*εισβασις των αγιων νηστειων*."\*

---

\* The designation Ash-Wednesday no doubt arose from the custom of sprinkling ashes upon the head of those entering upon a course of penance. As this day opened



The lessons for this day are selected, therefore, with direct reference to the idea of fasting, unfolding what may be regarded the proper attitude of spirit for such an act of penitent self-humiliation, and the reasons and aim of its institution upon the part of the Church. The fast is not to be viewed as an arbitrary imposition from without,—a new patch upon an old garment,—but as that which finds itself answering an inward disposition of self-abnegation and detachment from the world, and in full harmony with that Christian spirit which sighs in secret for heavenly and imperishable treasures, over against the moth and rust-corrupted, and thief-invaded wealth of the world. But the fast rests not in that which is negative merely,—in simply weakening and breaking the fetters which bind to earth,—but in something positive as well,—in strengthening and cementing the ties which bind to Heaven,—in turning with the earth-freed and undivided heart to God, the only tower of defence against the hosts that assault the heritage of the Lord.

Following this solemn proclamation, comes the Lent series of pericopes, taking up, in harmony with the Creed, the suffering, crucifixion, death, and burial of Christ, and what these mysteries involve for faith. The first Sunday in Lent, *invocavit*,\* has for its gospel lesson, selected with peculiar appropriateness, the fasting and temptation of Christ (Matth. iv. 1-11) immediately following His sacramental inauguration into His public ministry by His baptism in Jordan, which was attested by the voice of the Father, and sealed with the investiture of the Holy Ghost. In this selection, the Church designedly brings before us the primal, base fact of the whole conflict reaching out to death and hades, and the incipient victory also, which shadows forth the glorious consummation, when the whole kingdom of Satan is

---

the specific penitential season of the year, it gathered to itself in a particular way this general custom, pursued in reference to penitents at all seasons; and thus drew to itself naturally such title.

\* The first word of the Introit, taken from the close of the 91st Psalm [*clamabit* in the Gallicanum Psalterium: *invocabit* (MS. *invocarit*), in the Romanum Psalt.]—a Psalm which beautifully harmonizes with the whole scene of the Temptation, where, in the obedient trust and calm triumph of Jesus, the wondrous ideal of the inspired poet finds its only and perfect actuality.

overthrown, when the whole law of death is transcended, and Christ asserts His triumphal glory by entering the opened Heavens, leading captivity captive, and dispensing, through the eternal Spirit, gifts to men;—an omen thus of the coming woe, and a prelude of the certain victory.

It falls not within our purpose to attempt any detailed exegesis of the Gospel lesson. It is enough, in this connection, to remark that Christ's being led into the desert wilderness, and His long fasting and prayer there, were in no sense a shrinking from His mission among men, but an inward consecration thereto, corresponding to the mysterious reality of His sacramental inauguration in the preceding baptism. He could not forsake the world which on every hand demanded Him; nor could He realize His mission of redemption therein, except in full renunciation of the false attitude of its whole life. Called to the world by His whole mission, called to it by its own deepest wants, He was at the same time repelled from it by its own opposition, and by that of the prince who ruled in and over it. Such inward consecration to His calling, therefore, brought into clear survey the whole necessary pathway of conflict, the whole terrible wrestling with a false world-life. Indeed, the more complete the consecration to the Divine will (here perfect), the more undivided the dependence upon the supernatural, and the more entire the independence as regards the perverted world-order, the more direct and concentrated and powerful, on this account, the antagonism of the whole kingdom of evil. On the one side, the Heavens open, in glorious assignation of His Messianic office; but, on the other, the deep abyss of Hell is uncovered,—all the forces of evil feel the challenge, and unmasked, rapidly combine in opposing array, training their devilish enginery, so that the whole ministry of Christ must find itself a warfare from the very start, moving in the midst of this antagonism of forces, this conflict of light and darkness. The "glorious Eremité," standing by His consecration in the bosom of light, Himself light of light, and always poising Himself upon God, and confronted by Satan and his whole 'gloomy consistory,' begins a ministry involving all possible ethical antipathies and sympa-

thies, and whose issue must be final, and forever decisive. The crisis here is not only solemn, but absolute for the whole world.

In this view (although of course entirely inadequate), it is not difficult to see the profoundly significant relation here between the Gospel and Epistle selection. In the latter (2 Cor. vi. 1-10) we pass from the ministry of Christ in the flesh to the ministry of Christ in the Church. These two ministries are indissolubly joined together by the Spirit. "As the Father hath sent Me into the world, even so send I you." We, says the Apostle, work together with Him. The ministry in the Church perpetuates in the Spirit the ministry of Christ, and moves into the bosom of the same opposing forces,—the same world-wide antagonism, and is to assert and approve itself in the midst of antipathies and sympathies, by honor and dishonor, by good report and evil report, by death and life, by sadness and rejoicing, by poverty, yet making many rich, by having nothing, and yet possessing all things,—thus making real all the while the gospel mystery in which we see an "*Eden raised in the waste wilderness.*" It is this also which clothes the whole ministry of grace with such solemnity as to force home upon the Christian consciousness of all the need of that inward consecration, as well as that outward divine guardianship, which the Collect so earnestly prays for,—that self-fortification in the Lord to wrestle with principalities and powers as co-workers with Him, who, in the fasting and temptation in the wilderness, opened before Himself the obstructed pathway of redeeming love, and now calls us, especially in this appointed season of the Church, to take His Cross and follow.

The second and third Sundays in Lent, in the Gospel lessons, (Matth. xv. 21-28; Luke xi. 14-28), form a direct continuation of the first. Christ, on the threshold of His ministry, having met the Tempter, assaulting Himself, conquered Him. Now, in the prosecution of His redeeming mission, He carries the reality of this victory into the whole kingdom of Satan's disorganizing power among men. This disorganization shows itself in the physical as well as moral; and both serve to render more in-

tense the feeling of man's helpless misery. The reality of victory shows itself in both also, now in the awakened faith of those struggling with their misery, as they turn to the delivering grace, and now in Christ's exercise towards such of a cleansing power, dispossessing the devil of his lodgment within their life. Before the hallowing presence of Christ in His Messianic mission had entered the world, the devil, strongly armed, kept his palace and his goods securely; but the conquest in the wilderness revealed one still stronger, who, having overcome, now taketh from the devil all his armor wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils. The prosecution of this mission, however, concentrated on Christ the false judgment and malicious retort of the deceitful and now exasperated enemy. He casteth out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils,—the precursor of that infatuated cry, "*Crucify Him! crucify Him!*"

Now in perfect harmony with this objective work of Christ in the flesh, cleansing those in whom the devil had taken his residence, the Epistle lessons (1 Thess. iv. 1-8; Ephes. v. 1-9) take up that inward cleansing which the mystery of Christ, now present in the Spirit, must accomplish in every child of grace; the sanctification of the body as the temple of the Holy Ghost, the full cleansing of it in our vocation wherein we are called unto holiness and not unto uncleanness. All lusts of the flesh and all lusts of the mind show the presence of the vexing devil, making his return to the house whence he came out; but the children of the light, following Christ in the strength of His continuous victory, must manifest the reality of their birth in grace by their persevering victory over every such possible inward lodgment of the evil one. Here, as before, each lesson serves to deepen the sense of the solemn mission of self-consecration, of full detachment from the world of flesh, and full reliance on the powers of the world to come, which constitute the practical aim of this whole Quadragesimal season.

It is not out of place to remark here how very frequently this significant relation of Epistle to Gospel occurs throughout the pericopes of the Church Year, as though the Church were determined at all times to place the mission of Christ in the

flesh and His mission in the Spirit in mysterious synthesis before our faith. For example: The circumcision of Christ, which marks His sacramental birth-inheritance into the old theocratic economy as the child of Mary, has for its corresponding Epistle lesson the birth-inheritance in the new economy of grace by baptism,—a circumcision not made with hands. The consecration at the Temple, when the developing consciousness of His divine paternity leads Christ to pass quite beyond all the earthly associations of Nazareth, and turn to His inquiring Mother with such a penetrating question, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" has for its corresponding lesson again, the Christian's self-assertion of his position in grace by offering his body a *willing sacrifice*, and by conforming not to this world, but by being transformed by the renewing of his mind. This peculiar connection of lessons, which might be illustrated by any number of examples, is not fanciful and arbitrary. It rests upon the logic of Christianity itself, which regards the mysterious facts of the Saviour's life in the flesh, as perpetuated and made efficacious through the Church, age after age, among men. They are synthetized, of necessity,—as in the Creed,—by the power of the Holy Ghost.

We come now to the fourth Sunday in Lent, the lessons for which it is more difficult to understand in their relation to what goes before and to what follows after. This difficulty, however, is greatly obviated by bearing in mind that this Sunday marks the transition in which the work of Christ is coming to be viewed more in its positive character as making the humiliation through which He passes the base of a glorious exaltation. The sufferings of Christ are not to be viewed solely as so many painful experiences forced upon Him from without, awakening our deepest sympathies, but as so many positive redemptive acts, so many high-priestly offerings, in the consciousness of which our sympathetic self-abasement may be interfused with rejoicing, hope and love, as brightening from its shadowy twilight towards an Easter dawn. Christ not only suffers and dies as beleaguered by persecuting Jews, and Romans, and

principalities of evil; but, in the midst of all this, He offers Himself through the eternal Spirit, entering by His own blood into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. His broken body is to become the bread of eternal life; His poured out blood, the cup of immortality.

This Sunday, as marking such transition, has been very appropriately called mid-lent Sunday, looking back to the conflict in the wilderness and forward to the atoning sacrifice, and intermingling thus the lent, penitential sorrow with an incipient paschal rejoicing. The services of the Ancient Church made this Sunday, as it were, a table land in the valley of humiliation, from which might be descried, although from afar, the Cross glittering with light, which must turn the dark wilderness into an illumined paradise, and soon restore to the worship of the sanctuary the sounding Alleluias intermitted since Septuagesima. The Introit at once strikes the key-note—"Lætare Jerusalem et conventum facite omnes qui diligitis eam: *gaudete cum lætitia qui in tristitia fuistis; ut exultetis et satiemini ab uberibus consolationis vestræ.*"\* The prayer (oratio) continues the same: "Concede, quæsumus, omnipotens Deus; ut qui ex merito nostræ actionis affligimur, tuæ gratiæ consolatione respiciamus;" after the pattern of which the Collect in our 'Order of Worship' was formed. It must be evident from this that the Gospel and Epistle will be selected as moving in the same atmosphere of thought, the same tone of feeling. It is just this, as we have remarked, which renders it less difficult for us to catch the idea of the lessons selected for this Sunday.

The Gospel (St. John vi. 1-14) shows us Christ revealing this contrast, that, although He would not make bread out of stones at the call of the Tempter to appease His own hunger, He will yet marvellously multiply the loaves and fishes for those who, in following Him, have come to want;—that out of His fulness their necessities shall be met. At the same time, this was to be a trial of the faith of His disciples, turning them from their niggard earthly supply to Himself, whence cometh the mul-

---

\* Arranged from Isaiah, 66th chapter.



tiplied loaves; yea, whence cometh the bread of life. The lesson still further includes, both from its connection with the season and with the context of the gospel itself, the precious symbol that His body broken shall mysteriously multiply itself into a world-embracing Eucharistic feast. Lange has well expressed this symbolic element, when saying that, "in this miraculous feeding of the multitude, Christ announces Himself as one who, with His own being and life, satisfies the hunger of the world—who, by the sacrifice of His life, prepares for the world an eternal Eucharist, and feast of highest, truest, nourishment." Thus, as remarked just above, Christ does not pass through the conflict of suffering and death simply as a passive recipient of the persecuting malice of the world and the devil,—a martyr only by steadfast, heroic resolution in the path of virtue, so that the whole process terminates at the Cross, save in so far as it may stand out an imperishable example for subsequent ages, engaging our sympathies and stimulating our endeavors. Rather Christ turns the whole humiliation and suffering and death, although to the earthly sense quite opposite, into the glorious mystery of a high-priestly offering—the absolute sacrifice, in the perennial presence and power of which alone can we ever receive life everlasting. The Gospel lesson looks toward this. The large and hungered crowd, the want of money to purchase bread, and the small, inadequate supply, stand in marked contrast with, and to the eye of flesh indeed in direct opposition to, the festal satiety which followed. Neither Philip nor Andrew can find any answer to the Saviour's testing question, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat," other than the two-hundred pence and the lad with five barley loaves and two small fishes. So in the case of the hungering, famishing world-crowd of ages, physically and spiritually helpless, what answer can be given to its yearning cry, Whence can we buy bread, that we may eat and not die? It is vain to look to the poor array of worldly resources here, or yet to the manna even which the Fathers ate. But *letare*, there is a response in the mystery that Christ giveth His flesh for the life of the world. That which the world might regard, and did regard, the very

evidence of weakness and failure, becomes to faith the very source and substance of a festal, all-nourishing Eucharist for the Church.

"Cruz fidelis! inter omnes  
Arbor una nobilis!  
Nulla talem silva profert  
Fronde, flore, germine:  
Dulce lignum, dulce ferrum,  
Dulce pondus sustinens."

In full harmony with this general contrast, where two orders stand over against each other in such form that what is regarded weakness in the one becomes a condition and often a measure of strength in the other,—where the limitation and emptiness of flesh in the one are met by the freedom and fulness of spirit in the other,—a contrast reaching its full, paradoxal height in Christ, through whom an ignominious crucifixion becomes a glorious paschal reality of delivering and nourishing life,—in full harmony with this, we repeat, is the Epistle lesson (Gal. iv. 21–31), which joins its peculiar "*rejoice thou barren that bearest not*" with the "*letare*" of the Introit. In this lesson we have brought to view the sharp contrast between that which is according to the flesh (*κατα σαρκος*: within the resources of the natural world, justifying and authenticating itself to the apprehension of sense and natural judgment), and that which is through the promise (*δια της ευαγγελιας*: in the bosom of the supernatural,—the revelation of God manward, justifying and authenticating itself to the apprehension of faith). Ishmael is begotten fully in the order of nature, and according to human policy; and to those walking in the flesh he must have been regarded as the only possible inheritor of the promise. Even Abraham, in the perplexity which besets him, can see no other *whence* he can be a father of nations, than through Ishmael; and therefore he says unto God, "O that Ishmael might live before thee!" Isaac is begotten through the promise, directly in the face of impossibilities, when earthly relations only are brought into view. Abraham "said in his heart, shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and shall Sarah that is ninety years old

bear?" Subsequently, also, Isaac is received as one from the dead. The Apostle sees the deep, symbolic import of this, in making it an allegory through which the Messianic kingdom of grace is contrasted with the covenant of law, and with the whole order *κατα σαρκα*. The former gendereth children after the Spirit, in the bosom of supernatural realities; while the latter gendereth children in bondage under the elements of the world. Moreover these two elements are in hostile attitude. That born after the flesh persecutes that after the Spirit, and must be cast out as having no part in the glorious inheritance. The process in the Church, therefore, is a continuous crucifixion of the flesh, with the affections and lusts, only to give proper room, however, for the fruit of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith.

Dr. Fr. Strauss sees very clearly, in relation to this Sunday, the transition and contrast to which we have called attention, although he seems to ground it upon the natural year-season, with which beyond doubt it does, when occurring at its normal period, most beautifully harmonize.\*

From Mid-Lent Sunday onward to Good Friday, the Gospel selections bring out the conflict of light and darkness as now rapidly converging from lesson to lesson, towards the certain issue of the cross. As the powers of evil from every side draw nearer the Holy One in their exasperated endeavor to overwhelm Him, so He at the same time draws nearer to the bosom of His Father, confidently and entirely reposing upon His decisive judgment as both honoring Him and visiting condemnation upon His enemies (the *judica* of the fifth Sunday's Introit); and draws nearer, also, in the fervor of His redemptive love, to that small circle of susceptible souls in whose immediate presence He unfolds the hallowed mysteries of all this, as related to His high-priestly sacrifice and intercession. Anon,

---

\*... das (Licht) in ganzen Jahre nicht wieder so viel Blendendes hat als in dieser Zeit, die, wenn sie auch bis zum Eintritt der Sonne in den Widder allen Völkern eine Zeit der Trauer und der Klage blieb, doch, mitten in Klage und Trauer zu Jubel und Hoffnung aufwacht. Also Licht! Und auf dieser Grundlage die Freude der Hoffnung in der Trauer!" (Evang. Kirchejahr, s. 196.)

also, does He send lightning glances of glory from His person athwart the surrounding darkness, confounding while they exasperate the enemy; and then by His humble yet majestic repose amidst accumulating trials, transcending thus the whole pomp of His adversaries, He thrills with new ardor the hearts of those who love Him. There is, indeed, in the progress of these Gospel selections, a sublime climacteric grandeur, such as should characterize the closing scenes of the world's most profound tragedy.

In the gospel selection for the fifth Sunday (St. John viii. 46-59), Christ throws a bold challenge into the face of His conspiring foes, bringing them at once to the bar of judgment; confronts them with the untroubled calmness of His innocence saying, "I honor My Father and seek not Mine own glory"; startles them with the mysterious utterance, "If a man keep My saying he shall never see death"; confounds them by arraying the testimony of Abraham against their unholy use of His name, affirming, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day; and he saw it, and was glad"; and brings them at last to the exasperated silence of casting stones at Him, by the calm assertion of His eternal pre-existence, in those profound words, "Before Abraham was, I am";—each and all mysteries far more precious to us than blasphemous to them, because so many manifestations of His glory.

The selection for the next Sunday's Gospel (St. John xii. 1-16),\* transfers us from the throng of fierce persecutors to

---

\* In the Liber Comitis, the Gospel selection for this Sunday, "*Dominica in palmas*," commences with Matth. xxvi. 2. But for the following day, "*feria secunda*," the Gospel selection is the same as in our "Order of Worship." I will append here the schedule for this day as given in the "Conspectus Pericoparum" of Daniel. (Codex Lit. Tom. 2).

Liber Comitis	{	Marc. xi. 1 sq. (not given in Migne's edition nor in the synopsis)	
	{	Matth. xxvi. 1 sq. by Augusti.)	
	{	Phil. ii. 5 sq.	
Ecclesia Romana	{	Matth. xxvi. 1 sq.	Ecclesia Angl. { Matth. xxvii. 1-54.
	{	Phil. ii. 5 sq.	{ Phil. ii. 5 sq.
Ecclesia Evangel.	{	Matth. xxi. 1 sq. sive.	} Inasmuch as the week beginning with this Sunday took up the entire Gospel history of Christ's Passion, very easily a difference of lessons, for a given day, might occur by a difference in harmonizing the several accounts.
	{	Matth. xxvi. 17-29.	
	{	Phil. ii. 5 sq.	

the sweet retirement of Bethany, into the bosom of that beloved family, which now prepares for Him a supper, where Martha serves, and Lazarus, recovered from the corruption of the grave, sits in silent, holy awe, and Mary breaks the long-treasured, costly spikenard, and pours it on His feet, and wipes them with her hair. It seems as though we might now lose sight of the opposing darkness. But no! It has advanced only in depth and power. It has entered the select band of Apostles, and now casts over this hallowed scene of refreshment an appalling gloom; for Judas, who will betray Him, is there, reproving Mary's precious act of devotion, to which the Saviour gives such fulness of meaning, when saying, "Against the day of My burying hath she kept this." The rebuked Judas is silent. But there can be no repose when so near the awful crisis. The depths of hell are too violently disturbed; and now, almost as issuing therefrom, we hear the muttering conclave of chief priests consulting to put both Jesus and Lazarus to death.

The selection, however, does not close here. Christ enters Jerusalem to complete the mysterious sacrifice,—Himself the victim to be offered, now hastening to the altar which He will sprinkle with His all-atoning blood, and by one offering perfect forever them that are sanctified,—and Himself the King, whom the Prophets foretold, and whose prophecies the disciples unconsciously fulfilled in shouting their "Hosanna: Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord,"—the very anthem with which so uniformly the old liturgies (and our order of worship, also), rapturously welcome the mystery of His coming to the Eucharistic altar, Himself the sacrifice and the royal dispenser of the heavenly feast.

The Gospel lesson for Good Friday is the *Crucifixion*. According to the flesh, this would be viewed as the last and closing scene, leaving no room for Easter vigils. Indeed, because nature cannot transcend its fall, all tragedies, creations of the inspiration of genius only, close with death. But this, the work of the Eternal Spirit,—the inspiration of the imperishable life of Christ's person, transcending the whole law of

death, cannot close thus. It must of necessity sweep onward into the sphere of resurgent glory. "*Thou wilt not leave His soul in hades, neither wilt thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption.*" Therefore Good Friday is followed by the paschal vigils, including Easter Eve, or the *Sabbatus sanctus*, opening the way for the Dominica Sancta, or Easter. The Gospel lesson for this holy Saturday, in the Liber Comitis, is selected from Matth. xxviii. 1-8, linking the end of the Sabbath with the dawn of the first day of the week. Here, from the angel who sits upon the stone which he has rolled back from the door of the grave, the women receive the announcement of the resurrection, and hasten to bring the disciples the joyful word, not as yet, however, *having seen the Risen One*. In the "Order of Worship," the Gospel selection (Matth. xxvii. 57-66), does not so immediately connect itself with the Easter dawn, but takes up the burial, and marks the wondrous attraction of the holy sepulchre, over against which, after Joseph of Arimathea has departed, the loving Magdalene and the other Mary sit lingering and hoping and watching, not able to fathom the strange, prophetic emotions which are stirring within the deeps of their souls. In examining the Epistle series we shall see the same difference between the Liber Comitis and our Order of Worship in regard of this Easter Eve,—not a difference of faith at all, but a difference in the degree of nearness which is assumed in relation to the Easter dawn.

Let us now take up the Epistle series accompanying the Gospel selections which we have just now been discussing. Here we turn from the conflict as historically unfolded in the life of Christ in the flesh, to the inward mystery involved in the same as perpetuated by the mystical presence of Christ in the Church through the Holy Ghost,—the same synthetizing process to which we have had occasion already to refer, and which shows itself, as we shall subsequently see, in its full significance in the relation of the two great divisions of the Church Year, the one moving up to Pentecost, the focal point of transition, whence the series is then evolved onward to the



second Advent, in full harmony throughout with the Apostles' Creed. Indeed, just as the general law of the genus in the vegetable world, for example, finds utterance for itself throughout the whole structure of the individual plants in bud and leaf and blossom and fruit, just so does the general, plastic law of the Creed burgeon, leaf, blossom, and fructify throughout the service of the Church Year. But of this hereafter.

In the Epistle selection for the fifth Sunday (Heb. ix. 11-15), we have a lesson designedly chosen to bring into clear view, not the outward facts of Christ's sufferings and death, but the inward mystery of the same as having for mankind a perennial redemptive force. They are high-priestly offerings in the tabernacle not made with hands, clothed with imperishable reality because offered through the eternal Spirit,—the absolute life-power resident in the person of Christ, the very mystery which we see affirmed in the corresponding Gospel in the words, "If a man keep My sayings, he shall never taste of death," and still more emphatically in the statement, "Before Abraham was, *I am*."

So in the next Epistle selection (Phil. ii. 5-10 :—it should include the 11th verse, as in the Liber Comitis), the whole course of Christ's humiliation is made to be the base of that wondrous exaltation in which God gives Him a name above every name, challenging the adoration of all things in heaven, and in earth, and under the earth, and forcing from every tongue the confession that He is Lord to the glory of God the Father. The scattered palm branches, the sounding hosannas, which, if not from human tongues, must rise from the very walls and stones, the costly spikenard enfolding with fragrant odor the sweet entertainment of love, *all* given in the Gospel are indeed but the faint, earthly presension of the exaltation of the Epistle, where all things above, around, and beneath bend their knee at His name, where the everlasting doors of the New Jerusalem are lifted up that the King of Glory may come in, and where the quiet supper at Bethany is transfigured into the marriage supper of the Lamb, fragrant with the breath of eternal love. But the Epistle here, as elsewhere and almost

universally, must view the objective mystery as realizing itself subjectively in us through the Spirit. The exaltation, following the humiliation, and so organically linked therewith, is to repeat itself in the Church and in us. Our mind of self-abnegation and humiliation is made so to find its source and substance in that of Christ (*ἐν ὧν ὁ καὶ ἐν χριστῷ*) as to give all the while the warrant of our having fellowship in the glorious power of His resurrection.

In the next Epistle lesson, selected for Good Friday (Hebrews x. 1-25),\* we have the mystery of Christ's death in its most profound significance unfolded, and as nowhere else so sublimely. All the shadowy sacrifices of the Old Testament economy are made to find in Christ's sacrifice their fulfilment, and to pass away, giving place to *it*, as absolute and of ever enduring efficacy for the world, as consecrating a new and living way for us into the holiest, and as being an offering which perfects forever them that are sanctified. Here, as so often before, we recognize again how the two,—the objective historical reality, and the perennial efficacy thereof through the Spirit in the Church, are designedly synthetized in the lessons selected by the Church. Our whole process of sanctification is but the authentication within us of that objective self-sacrifice of Christ,—of that one offering by which He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. Delitzsch, in his comment upon these words, wherein the full emphasis of the Epistle selection rests, says with great force, "Sanctification, involving here both imputed and implanted purification from sin, is the way whereby the objective perfection already provided in the self-sacrifice of Christ gradually renders itself subjective in men." The Church cannot on Good Friday celebrate the death of Christ as a past historical event simply, but adds to the Gospel narrative such an Epistle selection as may emphasize the truth that the offering made upon the cross is an ever abiding reality, by the presence of

---

\* There is no regular Epistle lesson in the Liber Comitis. Our "Order of Worship" has here followed the Anglican Church; and very properly, for the selection is in full harmony with the general law regulating the pericopes, and not one of mere private caprice. On this ground it is that we treat it as genuine and in place.

Christ within the Holy of Holies, and by His presence through the Spirit in the Church. We cannot forbear quoting Delitzsch again, who has so finely grasped the meaning of the Epistle in this regard. "Christ brings before the face of God no offering which has exhausted itself, and, as only sufficing for a time, needs renewal; but He Himself is in person our offering, and by virtue of the eternal Spirit, *i. e.* of the imperishable life of His person, now forever freed from death, our eternally present offering before God." Dr. Nevin, in a recent article of this Review, has seized with even greater clearness and breadth of apprehension the deep truth which this Epistle selection unfolds; and no doubt it was under the impulse of just this method of Christian thought that the selection was originally made, and it is on this account that we find it so fully in harmony with the order of selections more ancient and more universally recognized.

The Epistle selection for Easter Eve in the *Liber Comitis*, (Coloss. iii. 1-4), is in unison with its corresponding Gospel, which conducts the vigil, as we have said, to the annunciation of the resurrection, although not to the vision of the Risen One, which belongs properly to Easter. Just as the women hurrying to the grave, which, although naturally the residence of the dead, has yet for them some mysterious attraction, as holding all they hold dear, which draws them they hardly know why, before the dawn breaks, to its very door, when the Angel calms them startled either by the earthquake, or by His own lightning countenance and glittering raiment, and says, "He is not here, for He is risen;" just so the vigils of the saints hurrying out from the pilgrimage of lent, looking and hastening unto the vision of the resurgent One, and feeling that all Christian life is mysteriously hidden with Him, awaits a kindred conclusion in which when Christ shall appear they also shall appear with Him in glory.

The Epistle selection in our "Order of Worship," (1 Peter iii. 17-22, originated we presume by the Committee), is also in full unison with its corresponding Gospel. The Gospel refers us to the burial—the rest with the dead, the vigil not con-

ducting us as yet to the Easter dawn. The Epistle, therefore, is selected as taking up the hidden, redemptive, significance of this as related to the intermediate state, to the Spirits in Hades.

Thus through the whole lent series of pericopes up to Easter, the selections are uniformly symmetrical, and designed throughout to emphasize the profound theological truth, that the objective facts or realities, as in the Creed, have a perennial redemptive power, surrounding now and interfusing the whole life of faith, because in the presence of Christ by the Spirit, in the Church they are continuously operative, apprehending and being apprehended in our whole process of sanctification. In other words, the Church in the organization of lessons so designedly related to each other, and so controlled by the order of the Creed, throughout her services gives utterance to what may be regarded the very substance of her constitution—the fulness of Him now filling all in all—or in the eloquent words of another, “the perennial, undying objectivity of the Christian salvation as holding from first to last, with the force of an endless now, in the Mediatorial Life of the Incarnate Word.”

The fast period is now closed, and we reach the Pascha *αυαστασιμον*, or Easter, the great paschal season, which, as a festival period, clusters around itself a series of pericopes gradually moving forward, after the order of the Creed, from the Resurrection to the Ascension and to Pentecost. The selections are controlled at first by the Easter mystery; but gradually in their transition they mark the coming ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost, towards which mysteries they steadily direct the attention. It is more correct, however, to say that the selections are designed by their very order and contents to bind the meditation and thought of the Church to the Resurrection, not as a doctrine, or a finished past fact, but as the mystery of that life now victorious over death and hell, and unfolding its inexhaustible fulness by moving forward into the Ascension and outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The transition to which we have referred begins properly at the third Sunday after Easter—*jubilate*. The selections which

precede are more immediately conditioned by Easter, while those which follow refer with increasing directness to Pentecost.

The Gospel selection for Easter Sunday in the Lect. Gall. is Luke xxiv. 1 sq.; in the Lib. Com., Mark xvi. 1-7; the same in the Calendar Rom.; in the Anglican Church, John xx. 1-10, which our 'Order of Worship' has followed, and which does not substantially differ from the more uniform selection from Mark, neither from the selection in the Lect. Gall. The selection from St. Mark takes up the earliest Easter dawning, in the Angelic annunciation to the women who came with sweet spices to anoint Christ's body—the first breaking light of the glorious mystery.

"Gaude, plaude, Magdalena  
Tumba Christus exiit,  
Tristis est peracta scena,  
Victor mortis rediit."

The selection from St. John adds to this the further progress of Easter when the mystery begins to be authenticated to the Apostles John and Peter. As yet in both cases it is the empty grave and the Angelic announcement only which recall to the disciples the promises which had been given, and which now enter as so many momenta in the awakening susceptibility which shall at last rapturously receive the Risen One. In the case of St. John, however, whose love was so deep, and whose eagle glance reached out so far, these outward circumstances alone are enough to bring quickly home to his heart the reality for which he had sighed since the hour in which he had stood overwhelmed with strange loneliness at the cross. He believed. The mystery of the resurrection found lodgment in the depth of his spirit never to depart therefrom.

Of course these gospel selections, by themselves alone, would be quite insufficient to unfold the outward, historical elements of the resurrection. But in the services of the Church they were supplemented by the lessons immediately following for Easter Monday and Tuesday, as well as by the lessons for the

Octave of Easter, and in such form also that we may see the mystery rising before the disciples from its reddening dawn to its effulgent noontide.

The Gospel selection for Easter Monday in the Lect. Gall. is Mark xv. 47—c. xvi. 1-11; in the Lib. Com., and Calen. Rom. Luke xxiv. 13-35, the same as in our "Order of Worship." In the lesson from St. Luke we have the revelation of the Risen Christ to the two disciples at Emmaus, for which He had prepared them on the way by unfolding the Old Testament references to Himself, and by showing how these clearly pointed out the pathway of suffering and death, through which He was to enter into His glory. This was added to the preceding circumstances, the empty grave, the vision of angels and their announcement, and the visit of John and Peter to the sepulchre. The Easter light is searching after and penetrating every susceptible heart, whatever darkness may stand in the way; intercepting here the departing two, who still keep in mind that it is the *third day*, and inwardly contend against their despondency; sending its piercing ray into the deeps of their troubled spirits till their hearts burn within them; and at last hurrying them back to Jerusalem overflowing with joy, to spread the glad tidings which they had not strength before to believe.

The selection for Easter Tuesday in the Lect. Gall. is Mark xvi. 12 to the end; in the Lib. Com., and Calen. Rom. Luke xxiv. 36-47. In this lesson, for the two are in reality one, the Easter light reaches its first height of effulgence, when Christ stands among the gathered disciples and says, "Peace be unto you," and confirms the mystery within them by all the possible evidences which either faith, or reason, or sense even, can demand or desire.

A series more beautifully connected, or more grandly progressive and instructive, from the angel seated on the stone rolled back from the grave to the Risen One, standing among His own and breathing upon them peace, cannot possibly be conceived. The more inward movement also, of struggling hopes and longings, sweet memories of promises still cherished,



clearer intuitions of prophecies, and at last joy overwhelming both fear and belief—the resurrection of Jesus within the spirit of the disciples—what celestial charm, what lyric pathos it has!

We turn now to the corresponding Epistle lessons. Here as before we pass from the outward, historical fact to the inward, spiritual mystery involved therein, which is made to be continuously effective by the presence of Christ through the Spirit in the Church. This in truth is just what the order and relation of the Canon of the New Testament, as organized by the Church, brings to our view. The Epistles are but the inspired utterance in the bosom of the Church, and in the process of its developing life, of Christ's presence in the Spirit, making real all the while the mystery of His presence in the flesh. The Epistles are bound back to the Gospels by the intermediate outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and the planting of the Church—the canon in its *order* follows the Creed, and in both the Pentecost mystery binds what goes before, and what follows after in organic unity. This general and profound synthesis, perpetuates itself so to speak throughout the pericopes in the relation of the Epistles to the Gospels, and designedly as is abundantly shown by the peculiarity of selection. When such relation is violated by the selection we shall invariably find some powerfully disturbing cause growing out of the immediate circumstances of the age, which for the time was felt to demand especial regard. We have already had occasion to remark this in reference to the singular Epistle selection for Circumcision in the Lectionarium Gall. It now meets us again in the singular Epistle selection for Easter Sunday in the Liber Comitis, viz: 1 Cor. v. 6–8. No doubt Augusti is correct in assigning the cause which he does for this selection, and in using it also as an argument in favor of the great antiquity of this collection of pericopes. Before the settlement of the Quartodeciman or paschal controversy by the Council at Nicæa, a custom prevailed quite extensively in the East of joining Easter immediately with the Old Testament pasch, and of observing it as a fast. The decree of the Nicene Council sought to do away with this, and

occasioned of course great excitement for the time, and demanded upon the part of the Bishops special attention and care. Hence they sought, where the old custom still prevailed to impress upon the people the great and necessary distinction between the Church pasch and that of the Jews. This gave currency to this selection from the Epistle to the Corinthians; and in confirmation of this, we find Chrysostom, in his Easter sermon at Antioch, employing the selection for just such purpose. Its subsequent retention in the collection rests upon the well-known aversion of the early Church, to change any custom having the Orthodox sanction of age. (See *Augusti*, Vol. VI. page 204).

The Easter Epistle in the Lect. Gall. is 1 Cor. xv. 1-19,—a normal selection, showing no such disturbing force as seen in the Lib. Com. In this lesson, the Resurrection comes to view, not in its outward, historical character, as an event in time, neither as a mere doctrine of the speculative reason, based upon a past fact, but as a mystery carrying with it the force of an ever present, death-conquering life, now, and at all times, the source and substance of our resurrection in such sense as that without it all that are asleep are perished. The Epistle in our "Order of Worship," Coloss. iii. 1-11, following here the Anglican Church, shows the same purpose of selection, taking up the fact that our mystical union with Christ is such as to bring us at once into full fellowship with the glorious power of His resurrection. "If ye were raised together with Christ, (*συννηγερθητε*)," referring back to the conditional statement of their being dead with Him, (Chap. ii. 20), and through this back to the unconditional statement of the fact of their having been buried together with Him in baptism, (verse 12)—*then*, the reality of this fellowship should show itself, on the one hand, in our death, so far as the order of the flesh,—the old man, is concerned, and on the other, in the continuous quickening of the new man, renewed after the image of Him that created him. The resurrection here, as in the other selection, is viewed as the source and substance, from beginning to end, of that life which is hid with Christ in God, that life which is in harmony with its

original divine idea, and which is so bound to the presence of Christ in the Spirit as to reach its consummation only when Christ's presence shall come to its full revelation of glory at the last day. This profound truth of revelation is beautifully expressed in one of the old Easter hymns:

"Resurrexit, et revexit  
Secum Deus hominem,  
Reparando quam creando  
Dederat originem."

The Epistle for Easter Monday in the Lect. Gall. is Rev. i.—ii. 7, and Acts ii. 14–39; in the Lib. Com. Acts x. 34 sq., the same as in our "Order of Worship." Both lessons from the Acts, alike bring into view the mystery of the Resurrection as fundamental to the very constitution of the whole ministry of the Church, as the central Gospel-fact, in the witnessing of which the whole Apostolate properly begins, and in the power of which it ever proceeds. The selection from the Apocalypse is to show that the resurrection is such a manifestation of the life of Christ's person as forever to seal the fact that He, now walking in the midst of the golden candlesticks, is the One who liveth, and was dead, and behold is alive forevermore, and hath the keys of Hades and of death,—the first begotten from the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth. The Epistle for Easter Tuesday in the Lib. Com. is Acts xiii. 16–33,—the magnificent appeal of Paul to the Jews,—“and we declare unto you glad tidings,” (the very core of the whole Gospel), “how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled unto us their children,” (the absolute response of Heaven to the whole scope of the old economy), “in that he hath raised up Jesus again, \* \* \* now no more to return to corruption.” Such selections as these in the old Lectionaria, penetrating at once to the very heart of the mystery which constitutes the festival, show the broad, comprehensive grasp of the faith of the early Church. Other selections of course might have been made, but none so thoroughly in harmony with the grand sweep of the old Creed, and none in the way of progres-

sive inter-relations manifesting such a wondrous architectonic genius.

The Sunday after Easter,—octabas Paschæ, called in the Lect. Gall. the close of the pasch (*clausum paschæ*), and by the Greeks, *Κυριακή του Θωμά*, completes in its Gospel lesson, (John xx. 24–31), what was left incomplete in the manifestation of the Risen One on Easter Sunday. The Easter light, emerging from the darkness of the grave and hades, searched after and penetrated every susceptible soul, as we remarked. But one of the eleven, not present at any of the appearances of Christ on the day of His rising, seems to have been so wedded to what may be called external evidence—the order of the world, and so unable to conceive the possibility of such a mystery as that of one coming from the grave in glorified life after crucifixion and burial, as to wave aside the whole statement of Peter and the others, determined not to believe unless he should see in His hands the print of the nails, and put his finger into the print of the nails, and thrust his hand into His side. How vividly do the outward, phenomenal elements of the Saviour's death still impress this disciple, who seems inclined to rest his faith thereon, as though faith here must of necessity be the result of external evidence, resting not in a supernaturally wrought intuition of the mystery of Christ's person unfolding the reality of such glorification from within, but upon a mere corporeal identity reaching at most no farther than flesh and sight, a revelation after all of flesh and blood only. The Easter light, before there can be any proper *clausum paschæ*, must show itself able to penetrate through this dark barrier of earnest, it may be, yet misguided skepticism, and give to faith its proper victory through a vision of the Risen One far transcending the mere measurement by sight of identity in the flesh. The presence of Jesus, directly challenging Thomas in his own guarded skepticism, brings at once from the inner spiritual susceptibility, still existing and now aroused, the unequivocal, unconditional response, "My Lord and my God," in the reality of which as truly of the Spirit no other witnessing from abroad can be longer required or indeed thought of.

In most beautiful and significant correlation with this is the Epistle selection, 1 John v. 4-10. In the Gospel lesson the world was near gaining the victory. Thomas, perplexed by what he must have felt to have been the fatal issue of the cross, depressed, and melancholy, separated himself from the other disciples, no doubt, however, seeking to convince his own mind in some way that the issue must be otherwise. The announcement to him that Christ had been seen by the disciples, although he could not conceive it to be possible, aroused in him his almost surrendered trust and hope. His susceptibility for the supernatural, not yet sufficiently purified and elevated to grasp the mystery of Christ's person, is, however, still active, and brings him back to the disciples, although demanding the clearest, outward evidence of sense before he will come to believe. It was, however, the tremendous power of just this outward evidence of sense, as in the crucifixion, which had so disturbed his trust and troubled his spirit, and which had to be overcome, and as he thought, by outward evidences of like character, although in opposite direction. Christ was dead, a certainty for sense and worldly judgment. The nails went through His hands, and the spear-thrust opened wide His side. These must be seen in His body now as alive again. But the mere vision of flesh could give nothing beyond the fact of being alive again as before, a fact far short of the mystery of the resurrection as a full transcendence of the whole sphere of mere natural life in the flesh. The spiritual body cannot be determined by carnal measurement, any more than the mystery of the Incarnation can be determined by anything in the sphere of flesh and blood. Now the Epistle is selected to show that faith can ground itself in no sense upon the worldly. The whole order of nature, with all its various powers and resources, science, art, government and whatever else may be added thereto in the same sphere, is entirely inadequate to satisfy the demands of religious life. It cannot by any of its processes, however far these may be carried, pass out of death into the victory of imperishable life. Indeed, as fallen, it stands in necessary antagonism to any such mystery. But this imperishable life, not a doctrine of immor-

talities, but the reality itself, covering body, soul, and spirit, entering the world in the Incarnation, and revealing its full victory, by the Resurrection, over the whole law of sin and death, reigning therein, and continuing an ever present, quickening energy through the Spirit in the Church,—this mysterious reality, we repeat, not as referring itself to judgment based upon proof beyond itself, but as apprehended by faith brought into exercise in its own immediate presence, gives to faith a power transcending all worldly forces, whatever may be their form or character,—a power never resting back upon the world for support, but on the contrary ever bringing this latter into its own sphere as its only home of deliverance and life. Thomas, standing in the holy presence of the risen Redeemer, no longer asks to put his fingers in the nail prints, no longer tries in vain to prop himself upon any extraneous evidence of such character, but exclaims, as the glorious intuition thrills his spirit, "*My Lord and my God.*" So must the world pass out of itself into the obedience of faith confronted by the powers of the world to come.

The Gospel selection for the second Sunday after Easter, (John x. 11-16), is substantially a continuation of what precedes. The disciples, by the awful tragedy of the Cross, scattered as sheep when the wolf enters the fold, have been seen in the preceding lessons running here and there, fearing the world, perplexed, disheartened and without any proper home, but at last *enfolded* by the shepherding presence of the Risen One, who quiets their consternation, and breathes upon them His own calm and triumphant peace. Thus Christ, while lodging within their spirits the image of Himself as risen and revealing to them that He leaveth not His sheep, but layeth down His life for them, and the disciples in turn joyfully recognizing and receiving Him as coming from the dead, both alike verify the precious statement of the lesson: "*I am the Good Shepherd, and know My sheep, and am known of Mine.*" An old Easter hymn has finely seized upon this meaning of the lesson. \* \* \* "*triumphali morte resurgens. Ducens secum primitiva ad cœlos membra et nuper dispersa revocans ovitia.*" The lesson,



however, carries us onward prophetically to the completed fold of the Church; for the Resurrection must move forward into the outpouring of the Holy Ghost and the establishment of the Church. The connection of the corresponding Epistle-selection (1 Peter ii. 20-25), is too apparent to need any remark.

The series of Gospel-lessons now, commencing with the third Sunday after Easter (jubilate), and continuing to Pentecost, connects itself immediately with this prophetic intimation of a fold ingathering both Jew and Gentile under the one Great Shepherd. The lessons, as before remarked, look forward to, and prepare the way for, the Ascension and outpouring of the Holy Ghost. The Easter Mystery must be viewed as widening into the glorification at the right hand of the Father, and into the coming of the Spirit to seal and make effective forever the presence of Christ in the Church. To mark just this, and to impress it upon the mind in the services of the Church, what more suitable selection could possibly be made than the Gospel-lessons, taken from the sixteenth chapter of John, where, as no where else, this profound subject is discussed and unfolded by the Saviour Himself!

We need not take up the lessons in way of separate exegesis. They are so bound together as a whole, that it will be sufficient to indicate here the great truths with which the Church, by their selection, designed to challenge the attention. First, it is quite evident from these lessons, that the glorification of Jesus, as returning unto the Father, is made the source and substance through the Spirit of the glorification of His people, and that this reality shows itself in the fact that the victory of Christ over the world is through the Spirit the very substance of such victory among His people, as they are brought within the sphere of a supernatural kingdom, in which are resident the powers of the glorified One, the powers of that æon into which He has ascended now made effective for the world through the Spirit—powers, which not only transcend the world, but which continually pass judgment upon it, and unmasking its evil bring it under condemnation. A little while, and the disciples shall not see Him, *κατα σαρκα*; but the dispensation in the flesh shall

be transcended, and again the disciples shall behold Him in the glorification of the Spirit. They shall have sorrow at first, as having no proper intuition of the mystery of this transition, and still too much wedded to the preceding stadium of His revelation. But their sorrow shall be turned into joy. Indeed their transient season of lamentation shall be but a birth-travail from the sphere of worldly vision into the glory of a new spiritual intuition and power, a joy which no world buffeting can dislodge from their faith. (*jubilate*). I go to the Father, but I return in the presence and power of the Comforter, bringing back to you the reality of full victory over the world in the fulness of the Spirit; who shall overcome the world either by convincing on the one hand or by convicting on the other, (*ελεγχεν*), bringing it to that most fundamental consciousness of sin, as not believing in Christ; bringing it to that most fundamental consciousness of righteousness manifested in the glorification of Jesus; and bringing it also to the most fundamental consciousness of judgment in that despoiling of principalities and powers, that condemnation of the prince of the world, openly declared through the Cross and openly attested by the consequent resurrection and glorification, a crisis indeed in which the disciples, however, pass out of condemnation into life. (*cantate*). The whole work of the Spirit is thus a glorification of the revelation in Christ Jesus as this is made to glorify the world. Now in the bosom of this mystery of mediation linking through the Spirit the earth beneath to the Holy of Holies above,—the throne of intercession, all prayer and petitioning must be made in the Name of Jesus. In the bosom of His mediation in the Spirit, in the presence of that one offering not exhausted, but perpetuated forever because offered by that eternal Spirit through which by the Cross the way was opened for the full assertion of victory in the resurrection and ascension and outflow of the Holy Ghost, all rogations, all litanies, all askings are to be made (*rogate, Dominica ante Litanias*). Indeed the intercession of Christ is but a mysterious manifestation in itself of the Father's love. Binding our petitions to itself, it is the continuous activity in which the High Priest

bears us, in whom He is Himself glorified, upon His heart into the immediate presence of the Father, who hath given us to Him, His Son.

The connection of the corresponding Epistle-series with the Gospel-lessons it is somewhat difficult to determine. There may have been some disturbing cause at work conditioning the selection here, as we have seen to be the case elsewhere. The joy, of which the Gospel for Jubilate-Sunday speaks, springs from a spiritual communion with Christ, in which the soul is lifted above its worldly surroundings. And this joy is placed in broad contrast with that which has its source and end in the flesh. In fact we find that the rejoicing of the world is placed directly over against the sorrow and lamentation of the disciples, "*Ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice.*" Just this contrast was made of special emphasis in the old service, as is evident from the fact that it constitutes the *verse* and *response* for the third nocturn, and is introduced in the *Antiphon* for Vesper. The Epistle may have been selected with direct reference to this, because therein Christians are guarded against all fleshly lusts which war against the soul, guarded against all joy whose source is in the order of this world, in reference to which, they, as risen with Christ and to ascend with Him, are to be as strangers and pilgrims. Whatever persecutions may be brought upon them on account of their seeming want of sympathy with worldly interests, must be met by no opposition in the same sphere, but on the contrary by that calm, spiritual composure and peace which reigns in the soul in communion with God, and which will ever place them in right attitude to the whole order of the world's life, although they may wrongfully endure sufferings for conscience toward God. This places the lesson in close connection with the preceding Epistle, serving as a continuation thereof.

The next Epistle-lesson may have been selected, because the gift of the Spirit, as sent from the Father, is to be viewed as the source of all good and perfect gifts coming down from the Father; so that Christians at all times, from their regeneration by the Spirit to their glorification in the same, may so feel their

entire dependence upon the supernatural, as to have their patience and meekness confirmed, by fixing their hearts, amidst the world's opposing vanity, there where alone are to be found true joys and everlasting peace. The Spirit is to guide into all truth, speaking whatsoever He heareth, and this mystery demands that the order of the world's life be surrendered in full obedience to His engrafted word which is able to save the soul. The next Epistle-lesson connects itself immediately with this, and gives practical expansion to its truth. The humble reception of the Spirit-engrafted word (*εμψυον* implanted with germinal life-power), now manifests itself in inwardly energizing and characterizing the whole activity of life.

There is evidently a penitential undertone in this series of Epistle selections, such as comes from a sense of the broad distinction between what the fleshly mind and what the spiritual mind regard as the proper elements of joy. The difference, here, is so great (especially emphasized both in the Gospel and Epistle lessons), as to constitute the Christian a pilgrim and stranger in the world, seeking his joy and his citizenship in the heavenly. This brings upon him of necessity the world's opprobrium, which, while it may disturb, must not cloud the vision of his faith, and which, while it may harass, must not tinge his intercourse in the world with gloomy impatience or angry rebuke. This penitential feeling, so natural when the spirit is turned towards the heavenly, and severed from the earthly, standing as it were upon the summit of Olivet, and gazing into the heavens, into which the source and centre of all its love has ascended, to come again at the last day in glory ineffable,—this penitential feeling, now awakening the prayer, “Even so, come, Lord Jesus,” or now the kindred exclamation, “I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ,” has found full expression for itself, in connection with this season, in the old, special three days’ service following this rogate Sunday; and, perhaps, as moving toward this, the selection of the Epistle lessons was to some extent controlled.\*

---

\* This three days’ service (*tres dies rogationum*), may have originated, it is true,

Space does not allow us, in this present article, to examine the pericopes beyond Ascension. We will conclude, therefore, with some general reflections upon the relation holding between the Church year and the natural year,—a relation which comes most prominently into view in just this cycle which we have been traversing. The relation of man to the lower, material order of nature, is at once obvious. In his own constitution the spiritual and material are seen to interpenetrate each other. These two worlds are mysteriously wedded together in the unity of his life. Man, therefore, not only finds within himself capacities opening toward the spiritual, and never satisfied until there is a real apocalypse of the heavenly; but he finds himself also interlinked, in all the ethical as well as physical elements of his being, with the whole order of nature existent in space and time. The world surrounding him, with all its various space-forms even, enters into the mould of his being. Though we are high-priests of nature, seeing quite beyond it the "vision splendid" of "that imperial palace whence we came," yet in an important sense

"We are what suns, and winds, and water make us;  
The mountains are our sponsors, and the rills  
Fashion and win their nursling with their smiles."

But in a more profound sense still, as more cognate to our soul-life, does the world, surrounding us in its ceaseless change and flow in time, involve us in its own periodic movement, and bring us into a sort of rhythmical harmony with itself. The completing cycles of the year have not only an outward movement beyond us, but are transfigured, so to speak, into our own physical and spiritual being, in such sort that we move onward with them and they with us, with a mysterious inward correlation

---

from some special circumstance,—perhaps may have been instituted by Mamertus (480), Bishop of Vienna, on the occasion of a dangerous invasion of wild beasts, (*Vid. Du Cange sub voce rogationes*). Still the continuance and extent of the custom may find its ground in the felt congruity of such a service with this particular season of the Church year. What originates a custom may be far different from that which extends it, and continues it for ages.

throughout. The year-cycle is not a mere arbitrary chart, mapped off into nearly equal divisions, to suit some mechanical ends—an almanac simply. It is a grand completed movement of the whole system of nature in which we stand, and with which we are in sympathy, not merely by a determination of will, but by the very constitution of our life. Man cannot, except by a harsh, unnatural stoicism, fail to articulate this sympathy, or fail to give expression to his sense of the deep, inward analogy holding here between his life and that of nature, by making the periodical time movement of the latter instinct with the spiritual contents of the former, by insphering it indeed with the ethical movement of his own life.

Hence, not arbitrarily and in the interest of mere fancy, but rather by the force of a real inward correspondence, has the religious life of humanity always linked itself with the order of nature, so as to make this in its recurring time-revolutions, the bearer of its own experiences, so as to transfigure it into its own image and likeness. The correspondence here, although it may be so deep and hidden as to escape our analysis, and incomplete because of the disorganization of sin, has yet been universally recognized, and we have reason to believe will find its full completion when the spiritual body and the new heavens and the new earth shall coexist in the glory of the resurrection. As might be expected, in heathenism the religious year is largely submerged in the natural. This is the case to such an extent indeed, as to lead many to refer the whole mythology, and all the pagan religious ceremonies, to a physical back-ground exclusively. In Judaism, where a direct divine revelation lodges itself in time, and develops its contents through history, the mysteries of the supernatural will control the formation of the sacred year, not shutting out the natural, but really apprehending this, and carrying it up, in proper accord with the intimate correspondence referred to, into its own higher movement and meaning.

The week-cycle here, reflecting the divine creative mystery, holds within itself for us a precious symbolism, in which the completed earth-activities come to blossom into a hallowed



sabbatic rest—ever recurring from year to year, because that rest yet *remaineth* ; but sealed to us by the unfailing warrant of Christ's resurrection, ( the completed recreation ) which makes the Sabbath now the Lord's day of the Church,—dominica dies, just as each year has become an annus Domini. Yet more significant, for the purpose we have in hand, is the sacred Jewish year, made up of these recurring week-cycles, but beginning by divine ordinance with the paschal festival, which is linked by Jehovah Himself with that period or epoch in the natural year which most intimately and impressively adumbrates its spiritual import. "And the Lord spake, saying, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months. It shall be the first month of the year to you." The reason of this is quite evident from the context. It was to be the time which marked the deliverance from Egypt and the destroying Angel,—the beginning of a new and brightening period reaching out to their entrance into the Holy Land,—the renewal of the promise which had slumbered so long beneath the chilling frost of Egyptian servitude,—the significant turning-point of the whole national theocratic life,—the profound symbol too of that mystery of mysteries through which, in the pasch of grace, humanity shall be delivered from sin's bondage and renewed, and the long slumbering promise shall awake into glorious, eternal fulfillment. Who can fail to perceive here the significant correspondence between the natural season, ( the vernal equinox ), and the festival itself, neither fanciful nor arbitrary, but by the very ordinance of God Himself? Hence our faith has full right to bring into clear vision all the analogies, all the hidden inward coincidences which may serve to transfigure for us the whole natural into the supernatural.

We cannot in this article speak of the subsequent Pentecost, although here again we are met by the same profound correspondence. We hasten to remark that the Jewish sacred year is brought to its proper fulfillment in the Church Year. The New Testament pasch or Easter is the hinge of the whole Church Year, just as the Resurrection has come to mark off the recurring week-cycles. It is the focus from which the whole antecedent

movement is illumined, and the whole subsequent development irradiated. As a movable feast it is *Anni parens*, and as immovable (March 25), it is *Radix temporis* (See F. Strauss, p. 221). Here as of right the correspondence between the life of nature, and the revelation of the supernatural, comes to its fullest significance, far transcending what meets us either in Judaism or Heathenism. Spring resurgent from the grave of winter, breaking through the rock-closed sepulchre, rousing from slumber the myriad hidden germs of earth, and bearing upward into the genial air the whole awakening vegetable world, glorifying the crude material in forms of grace and beauty which hasten to send their blossoming fragrance towards the uplifted gates of light, renewing the whole face of nature,

*"Ætiamque novo faciem splendore serenans,"* (as Arnulf so beautifully sang),—making the whole earth jubilant, and the whole air resonant, with the universal joy of such renewal,—what is all this, but a magnificent parable, read and understood as never before, when Easter has removed the veil and shown us its own hallowed spiritual counterpart, transfiguring it in our faith, preparatory to its transfiguration in glory? What Heathenism and Judaism aspired to in this regard, Christianity has accomplished, fulfilling thus their whole prophecy, and that of nature also. The old Easter hymns could not well fail to seize upon this truth. It meets us indeed everywhere as the spontaneous utterance of faith.

[*"Eia harmoniis, socii, laudum resonis*

*Hujus splendide vernantis celebremus gaudia simul temporis."*]

And again:

[*"Ecce renascentis testatur gratia mundi*

*Omnia cum Domino dona redisse suo.*

*Tempora florigero rutilant distincta sereno,*

*Et majore poli lumine porta patet,*

*Jamque triumphanti post tristia tartara Christo*

*Undique fronde nemus, gramina flore favent.*

*Legibus inferni oppressis super astra meantem*

*Laudant rite Deum lux, polus, arva, fretum."*]

To regard this a weakness of Christianity, and an evidence against the Church Year, because manifesting a false accom-

modation to pagan naturalism or a shrewd calculating, compromise with the world's credulous superstition, is in the end but a denial of all relation between nature and grace, a veritable losing sight of the grand truth that the Incarnation is the mystery which interprets, and gives meaning to the whole symbolization of nature. As well might the fundamental fact of Christianity, the Word made flesh, be regarded as an accommodation to the oriental incarnation process, or the occidental apotheosis, because fulfilling the prophetic element underlying each.

Easter, as we have said, is the hinge of the whole Church Year—the centre of the whole antecedent and subsequent movement. Hence it does not commence the sacred Year as did the passover in the Old Testament. The advent of Christ in servant form, who revealed not the glory lodged in His person, except through the struggle and victory of the Cross, but ever moved towards this, just as the germs of nature through winter lie hidden to come in the end, however, to a real epiphany of all the possibilities lodged within them,—the advent properly begins the Church Year. Yet only in the light of Easter does this throwing back of the beginning of the sacred Year to that of the natural year become significant; for it alone gives to that natural winter-beginning its proper spiritual transfiguration in such form as Judaism could not and did not.

We cannot follow this subject further at this time, and attempt to trace out in detail this beautiful, far-reaching and profoundly significant correspondence. Strauss in his valuable work on the Church Year has, with great research and with a peculiarly fine æsthetic insight, brought this element into prominence; and no one, who will make it a subject of earnest study, can fail to be more thoroughly struck with the truly wonderful architectonic genius displayed in the structure of the Church Year, embracing in its comprehensive compass and reorganizing under the power of its higher principle all that has gone before in the efforts of religion to construct a sacred Year.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON; ECCLESIASTES OR KOHELETH;  
THE SONG OF SOLOMON. *New York: Charles Scribner & Co.,*  
654 Broadway, 1870.

These books of the Bible are published in one volume, in the series of Lange's Commentary, edited by Dr. P. Schaff. The commentary is by Dr. Otto Zöckler, Professor of Theology at Griefswald, and the translations are, the first by Rev. Charles A. Aiken, Ph. D., Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.; the second edited by Prof. Tayler Lewis, LL.D., and translated by William Wells, A.M.; the third by W. Henry Green, D.D., of Princeton, N. J. Dr. Zöckler belongs to the younger generation of German divines. He is but *thirty-seven* years old, but is the author, already, of a number of important theological Treatises, and is engaged now upon the book of Daniel. This volume fully sustains the reputation this great work has already acquired.

PRINCIPLES OF A SYSTEM OF PHILOSOPHY; *By Austin Bierbower, A. M., New York: Carlton and Lanahan; San Francisco: E. Thomas; Cincinnati: Hitchcock and Walden, 1870.*

The wise man has said, "Of making many books there is no end." Many write books who have no vocation for the work. The little book here noticed discusses profound themes, such as have occupied the minds of such men as Leibnitz, Kant, Hegel, &c. Of his ability to treat them, the reader may, perhaps, be able to judge from the opening paragraph.

"We are accustomed to think that everything was created by God. There are, however, certain laws which have always existed, and so do not depend on Him for their existence, and which could not but exist, and so could not have been made different, or even be changed."

The author tries to reconcile Philosophy and Christianity—his intention is good, but the effort is weak.

BIBLE GEMS: OR MANUAL OF SCRIPTURE LESSONS. *Specially designed for Public Schools, but equally adapted for Sunday Schools and Families. By R. E. Kremer. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1870.*

We cordially join our commendation of this little volume to those already given. Its introduction into any of our Schools would be

followed with good results, but it would be especially desirable that it should be used in the public schools. We do not know what may be its fate in this direction. It is commended for this purpose by J. P. Wickersham, LL.D., State Superintendent of Public Instruction. If our Public Schools are to be saved from the spirit of infidelity, people must see that some instruction of this kind must be introduced into them. We hope this book may not be shut out from schools of any kind.

ANCIENT STATES AND EMPIRES: *for Colleges and Schools.* By John Lord, LL.D., Author of the "Old Roman World," "Modern History," etc. New York: Charles Scribner & Company, 1869.

With the examination we have given to this work, we are favorably impressed with its adaptedness for use in Colleges and Schools, as well as its value for private reading. It is divided into three parts. I. The Ancient Oriental Nations. II. The Grecian States. III. The Roman Empire. One peculiarity of the work is the large space it gives to those great movements in history, to which the Scriptures refer. The spirit, also, of the author, in the use he makes of Scripture, as well as that which pervades the whole work, is pervaded by a Christian tone. There are some things in the first part (which is a sort of epitome of Biblical history) which might be criticised. For instance, when the author says: "There are various geological phenomena in all parts of the world, which can not be accounted for on any other ground than some violent disruption produced by a universal deluge." Again, when he seems to link the degradation and slavery of the negro race to the curse pronounced on Canaan. But the work altogether is worthy of the favorable opinions it has received from those competent to judge, and we join in commending it as well suited for classes in the study of Ancient History.

THE LIFE OF JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER, D. D., *Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey.* By Henry Carrington Alexander. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1870.

The only objection to this excellent biography of a great and good man, if, indeed, it be an objection, is, that the matter was not condensed into one volume. We say this, not so much because there is too much amplification, but because it would be read more generally if the matter were thus condensed. Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander was no ordinary man, and belonged to no ordinary family. He was widely known as a most accomplished scholar, and devoted Christian; but only those who moved in the circle of his personal acquaintance could estimate and appreciate him as he deserved. His early progress and proficiency in scholarship were truly remarkable. He began the study of Latin as soon as he began to read, and at ten years of age he commenced the Hebrew. Already at thirteen he

was working at Arabic. His subsequent progress in the languages is known.

The reading of such a biography must produce good effects upon all, but especially upon the young. No better book could be placed into the hands of students; though, for their sake, we would like to see it in one volume.

**STUDIES IN THE GOSPELS.** By *Richard Chenevix Trench, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin.* New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1870.

The only introduction this work needs to the readers of this Review, is a statement of the subjects of which it treats. 1. The Temptation. 2. The calling of Philip and Nathanael. 3. Christ and the Samaritan Woman. 4. The Sons of Thunder. 5. Wisdom Justified of her Children. 6. The Three Aspirants. 7. The New Piece on the Old Garment, etc. 8. The Transfiguration. 9. James and John offering to call fire from Heaven, etc. 10. The return of the Seventy. 11. The Pharisees seeking to scare the Lord from Galilee. 12. The Unfinished Tower, etc. 13. Zaccheus. 14. The True Vine. 15. The Penitent Malefactor. 16. Christ and the two Disciples on the way to Emmaus. A volume of 325 pages. Those who have his other works, especially *ministers of the Gospel*, will desire to add yet this one, containing the Studies in the Gospels of so genial and original an author.

**BIBLE ANIMALS; Being a Description of Every Living Creature mentioned in the Scriptures, from the Ape to the Coral.** By the Rev. J. G. Wood, M. A., F. L. S., etc. Author of "*Homes without Hands*," "*Common Objects of the Sea-shore and Country*," etc. With one hundred new designs by W. F. Keyl, T. W. Wood and E. A. Smith. New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1870.

Those acquainted with the learned author of this work, need not be informed, that it is prepared with the utmost care and ability, and may be safely consulted as good authority on all the subjects of which it treats. It is not a book with a mere taking title, as having to do with the Bible. It is a truly scientific work. The style in which it is gotten up, and the designs, are in the best style. Altogether this is a book well worthy a place in every library.

**ESSAY ON DIVORCE AND DIVORCE LEGISLATION, with Special Reference to the United States.** By *Theodore D. Woolsey, D.D., LL.D., President of Yale College.* New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1869.

This volume contains six chapters, as follows: I. Divorce among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans. II. Doctrine of Divorce in the New Testament. III. Law of Divorce in the Roman Empire, and in the Christian Church. IV. Divorce and Divorce Law in



Europe since the Reformation. V. Divorce and Divorce Law in the United States. VI. Attitude of the Church toward Divorce Law; Principles of Divorce Legislation.

The subject is a highly important one. The topics treated serve to show, that the author has traversed the whole field, and brought out history and facts, which will give the reader an intelligent view of the whole subject.

**HISTORY OF THE CHURCH in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.**

By K. R. Hagenbach, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Basle. Translated from the last German Edition, with Additions, By Rev. John F. Hurst, D.D. 2 Vols. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway, 1869.

Those who are acquainted with Dr. Hagenbach's valuable contributions to theological science will be prepared to look with favor upon this work, traversing a somewhat new field. We have more written upon the remote ages of the Church, than upon its more recent history. It seems to be presumed, that we are fully conversant with the latter, or else perhaps, that it is as yet an unfinished period. The work is made up of a series of lectures, and is written in an interesting style. The translation seems to be well executed.

The author, Dr. Hagenbach, does not seem to make any effort to give the inner tendency of the Protestant Church life in these two centuries. Indeed the German writers are very little exercised on the Church Question, which excites so much attention in England and America. But why should they? They live in Germany, and their business is to delve in the mines of thought, while they have no concern whether the Church is going on right or not: what has that to do with their theories? They seem hardly to know, that there is a Church in England and America. Sometimes a page or two is devoted to the United States. In the present volumes this country is almost entirely ignored. Yet the volumes are fraught with much interest; for, after all, Germany is the heart of Protestantism, and one can study it there in pretty much all its varied and varying phases.

**THE MARRIAGE OF THE KING'S SON, AND THE GUILT OF UNBELIEF: Two Sermons, By Rev. William James, with some Memorials of his Life. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph and Company 770 Broadway, 1869.**

This is a beautiful and interesting little *memorial volume* of fourteen pages. Its contents are: 1. Prefatory note; 2. Outline of Mr. James' Life. By Rev. Wm. B. Sprague; 3. View of Mr. James's character and life. By Rev. Henry Neill; 4. Letters; 5. Sermons—two, as above designated. To commemorate in a suitable manner the lives of the faithful ministers of Christ is a pious work, which must commend itself to all Christian hearts.

ILLUSTRATED LIBRARY OF WONDERS. *I. Adventures on the Great Hunting Grounds of the World.* By Victor Meunier, Illustrated with twenty two wood-cuts. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869. *II. The Ingenuity of Animals, with Illustrative Anecdotes.* From the French of Ernest Menault.

Two volumes of this celebrated library. The young will rejoice to get them. They are the kind of books to put into the hands of boys and girls. They are written in a pleasing style, and furnish a rich fund of information in reference to the wonders of nature.

THE HISTORY OF ROME. By Theodor Mommsen. Translated with the Author's Sanction and Additions, by the Rev. William P. Dickson, D. D., Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism, in the University of Glasgow, late Classical Examiner in the University of St. Andrew's. With a Preface by Dr. Leonhard Schmitz. New edition, in four volumes. Vol. I. New York: Charles Scribner & Company, 1869.

This greatest history of Rome yet produced, equal in learning to Niebuhr's and at the same time more popular, is here brought before the American public in a handsome dress and convenient size. The student of history, especially after having dived in the fabulous lore of Rome, will feel a peculiar interest in following one upon whom he can rely implicitly, as he separates facts from fables, and tells us the natural story of the origin and early history of the most noted people and city in the whole history of the world. It ought to find its way at once into all the libraries of our Schools and Colleges, as well as those of a private character.

Vol. II. of this truly great work has been received. It is in some respects more fascinating than the first volume. The great campaigns of Hannibal are given with such interest, that one can hardly lay down the books after commencing them before they are concluded. Everywhere, too, one feels that he is following a master, who knows how to discriminate between what is well attested, and what is of doubtful authority.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By James Anthony Froude, M.A., Late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. III. to VIII. New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1870.

We noticed this work in a former number of the Review. It is worthy of the favorable notices which it has received on all sides. The first publication of this work was quite as much an event as the publication of Hume's or Macaulay's Histories. The present popular edition issued by Charles Scribner and Company, brings it within the reach of a large circle of American readers. As the history progresses—the stand-point of the author becomes more and more strongly marked. To the end, the character of Henry the VIII, comes out in a much more plausible and honorable light

than we are accustomed to see it represented in history. We commend the work as one which will fasten the attention of the reader to the end.

ESSAYS ON SOME OF THE PECULIARITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. *By Richard Whately, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. From the Seventh London Edition. Andover: Warren F. Draper, Main Street. 1870.*

A very handsome volume of about 300 pages. Its popularity is manifest from the number of editions through which these essays have passed in England. In the latter part of the volume is to be found the celebrated essay, "Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Bonaparte," from the *eleventh* London edition.

Whately is no favorite of ours, but his character as a writer, his merits and demerits, are so well known that nothing is necessary to be said on this point. The essay on Napoleon itself is worth a place in a library as a historical document to which reference is frequently made.

ESSAYS ON THE SUPERNATURAL ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY, *with special reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tübingen school. By George P. Fisher, D.D., Professor of Church History in Yale College. New and Enlarged Edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., No. 654, Broadway, 1870.*

I. The Nature of the conflict of Christian Faith with skepticism and unbelief. II. The Genuineness of the Fourth Gospel. III. Recent discussions upon the origin of the first three Gospels. IV. Baur on parties in the Apostolic Church, and the character of the Book of Acts. V. Bauer on Ebionitism and the origin of Catholic Christianity. VI. The Mythical Theory of Strauss. VII. Strauss's Restatement of his Theory. VIII. The Legendary Theory of Renan. IX. The Critical and Theological opinions of Theodore Parker. X. An Examination of Baur and Strauss on the Conversion of Paul. XI. The Nature and Functions of the Christian Miracles. XII. The testimony of Jesus concerning Himself. XIII. The Personality of God: in reply to the Positivist and the Pantheist.

This table of contents will give some idea of the train of thought carried through these essays. It will be seen at once, that the author grapples with the most recent forms of skepticism directed against Christianity. That he brings a high degree of ability and skill to bear upon the treatment of the subject must be acknowledged. The work is certainly a valuable contribution to our recent Apologetic literature, and is eminently worthy of being studied by students of theology.

What will strike the reader of these essays, is the fact that what are now regarded as the most dangerous assaults on Christianity come from Germany. The Tübingen School lead off, and Renan

and Theodore Parker follow. It is quite natural, that the country which has given the world the most profound treatment of Christianity, and the greatest systems of Philosophy, should develop also the most dangerous attacks against our holy religion. This latter results from the former, and is a necessary consequence of that freedom of thought, which came in with the Protestant Reformation. Old traditional orthodoxy cannot rest quiet under these assaults. It is not sufficient to cry down German speculation, as was formerly the habit, especially in New England. It has been found necessary, even in the centres of Puritanism, to make an effort at least to master the great problems of thought, that have agitated and convulsed the mind of Germany during the last three centuries.

Time was, and still is, in the Roman Catholic Church, when heresy could be put down by the ban of authority. That ended the matter. Even so great a master of learning and thought, as the lamented Balmes could close his truly able and eloquent work on Protestantism and Catholicity with the remarkable words: "*As soon as the Sovereign Pontiff, the Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, shall pronounce sentence against any one of my opinions, I will hasten to declare that I consider that opinion erroneous, and cease to profess it.*" These are remarkable words, and raise the question, whether a man can thus consider an opinion erroneous on the mere declaration of authority, without being first convinced of his error. Whichever way this question may be decided, we have here a different principle from that of Protestantism. The words above quoted could not, at any rate, have been uttered, by Luther. "Convince me of my error, and I will change my opinion," was his utterance, and it is the utterance of Protestantism. We do not mean by this, that Protestantism rests its teaching on the authority of human reason, by any means, but it has committed itself to full freedom of thought, and it proposes to meet and vanquish error without interfering with this freedom. Hence alongside of Protestantism, and in it, have arisen those gigantic systems of modern philosophy, which assert the autonomy of the human mind in its own sphere. So also Protestantism seeks to put no ban on scientific research, even though it may be used as a weapon against Christianity itself. From all this, comes, of course, new conflict, but the victory in the end, must rest freely on the side of that supernatural revelation, which came from the same God, who has revealed Himself in the world of nature and of mind. This conflict must be expected to go on, until the last stronghold of error is broken down, and the absolute reason authenticates itself, through the last revelation in Christ, in the reason no less than in the faith of men.

We are led to feel, in reading this and similar works by English and American scholars, who delve in the rich mines of German learning, that the material thus obtained can be presented with greater

force through this reproduction, than by the German mind itself. The English mind is direct and practical. It rests not with a consciousness of having mastered error in the University, but seeks to bring the truth to bear continually in the life of the community.

Our regret is, that, in the Anglo-German institutions of the middle States, especially of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches, better provision is not made to cultivate more extensively a field for which they are so well qualified. Our professors are compelled to devote all their hours to the work of the class-room, with no time to give to the world the result of their ripe studies. New England, with far less advantage, has begun to cultivate, in an earnest way, University studies. When will the strong and wealthy Reformed and Lutheran Churches found an institution sufficiently well supplied with professors, to perform the great work for philosophical and theological science, to which, by their Anglo-German character they are called?

#### QUARTERLIES.

THE AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, *January, 1870, (New York).*—1. What is it to Think. 2. Sin and Suffering in the Universe. 3. The Meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York. 4. Inspiration and the Historic Element in the Scriptures. 5. Biblical Theology, with Especial Reference to the New Testament. 6. The Development of Doctrine. 7. Solomon's Song. A New Reading of its Plot. 8. New German Works. 9. Contemporary Literature. 10. Literary and Theological Intelligence.

THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW. *January, 1870. (New York).*—1. The History and Literature of Civil Service Reform. 2. The Early Regeneration of Sabbath-School Children. 3. The Life of Samuel Miller, D.D., LL.D. 4. A Fragment. What the Greeks thought of the Religion of the Jews. 5. The Reign of Law. 6. Adjourned Meetings of the General Assemblies at Pittsburg. 7. The Life of Joseph Addison Alexander, D. D. 8. The Presbyterian Church—Its Position and Work. 9. Notices of Recent Publications. 10. Literary Intelligence.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA. *January, 1870. (Andover).*—1. The Incarnation. 2. Revelation and Inspiration. 3. The Human Intellect. 4. The Progress of Truth dependent on correct Interpretation. 5. Bethesda and its Miracle. 6. The Doctrine of the Apostles. 7. Recent Theories on the Origin of Language. 8. New Studies in Egyptology. 9. Assyrian Studies—Text Books. 10. The Topography of Jerusalem. 11. Notices of Recent Publications.

THE METHODIST QUARTERLY. *January, 1870 (New York).*  
 1. Ernest Renan. 2. On the Power of Mind over Matter. 3. Holy Scripture a Divine Revelation. 4. Mathematics as an Educational Instrument. 5. The Bible better than the Œcumenical Council. 6. The Twenty-Second Psalm. 7. Inspiration of all Scripture. 8. Religious Intelligence and Notices of Recent Publications.

THE EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY. *January, 1870 (Gettysburg).* 1. Importance and Connection of Works and Faith. 2. The Influence of Revivals on the State of Religion. 3. Reminiscences of Lutheran Ministers. 4. Piety and Property. 5. The Greatness of Being Useful. 6. The Chinese Problem. 7. The Ascension of Christ. 8. The Question of Close Communion. 9. Christ's Prophecy of His Sufferings. 10. The Total Eclipse of the Sun of 1869. 11. Notices of New Publications.

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY. *January, 1870 (Philadelphia).*  
 —1. Christ's Exaltation and Second Coming. 2. Spectrum Analysis. 3. Conception of Christ and Christianity in "Ecce Homo." 4. The New Dominion. 5. Baptism in the Greek Church. 6. The True Method of Preaching. 7. Exegetical Studies. 8. Book Notices.

THE JOURNAL OF SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY. *December, 1869 (St. Louis, Mo.).* 1. The Exposition of the Science of Knowledge by Fichte. 2. Bernard's Analysis of Hegel's *Æsthetics*. 3. Berkeley's Doctrine on the Nature of Matter. 4. Hegel's First Principle. 5. The Problems of Philosophy at the Present Time. 6. Is Thought the Thinker? 7. Preface to Vol. III.

THE THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM. *January, 1870 (Nashville, Tenn.).*—1. The Necessity of a Knowledge of Ecclesiastical History to Young Men preparing for the Ministry. 2. The Atonement. 3. Preparation for the Pulpit. 4. Infant Salvation. 5. Power in the Pulpit. 6. A Right View of the Church necessary to a Right View of the Ministry. 7. Woman's Work in the Church. 8. The Bible in the Public Schools—Book Notices.

SOUTHERN REVIEW. *January, 1870 (Baltimore).*—1. What is Moral Science? 2. The Life of Garrick. 3. The Legend and Literature of the Wandering Jew. 4. Newton's First Law of Motion. 5. Anglo-Saxon Literature. 6. Hugh Swinton Legare. 7. The Cotton Interest. 8. The Wave Theory of Physics. 9. Scientific Ballooning. Daphles; A Poem. 10. Notices of Books.